Class 283.323 Book
General Theological Seminary Library
Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.
Besides the main topic this book also treats of
Subject No. On page | Subject No. On page
K 778.2
H

W. Walton

May 25. 1843.

The gift of Mrs. Gordon
Tompkinsville. Ascension Day
1848.

W. III. 9

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

NATURE AND EFFICACY

OF

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By VICESIMUS KNOX, D. D.

SANE JAMDUDUM MIHI VISI SUNT MULTI NOSTRORUM SACRAMENTORUM VIM NIMIS DILUTE ATQUE FRIGIDE EXPLICARE.

GROTII EPIST.

THE SECOND EDITION.

GEN. THEOL. SEM. PROT. EPISC. CH. LIBRARY

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. NUNN, GREAT QUEEN-STREET, LINCOLN'S-INN-FIELDS,

1808.

265.323F
K778.2
6431

R. WILKS, PRINTER,
Chancery-lane.

PREFACE.

"IF the Christian Religion be, indeed, what it declares itself, a Revelation from Heaven; if a chief part of its design be to renovate, to purify, and exalt our nature, how mortifying my disappointment," says a writer, who describes England under the character of a *Chinese* Travell e, "when I found myself in the midst of a nation, not without noble instances of learning, indeed, and abilities of every kind, but IMMORAL IN A HIGH DEGREE, and so uninspired with DEVOTION, that its most glaring characters are INDIFFERENCE or CONTEMPT FOR ALL RELIGION."

If this account be true, it is alarming even to those who, without pretending to much religion, profess a regard for the wel-

welfare of their country; since MACHIAVEL, the ORACLE of politicians, declares, that THERE IS NO SURER PROGNOSTIC OF RUIN IN ANY STATE THAN TO SEE DIVINE WORSHIP NEGLECTED OR DESPISED.

Let the following observations, quoted by the *Chinese*, be applied to a neighbouring nation; and to our own also, if the application shall be found proper and useful.

"YOUTH born and brought up," says the virtuous BISHOP BERKLEY, "in wicked times, without any bias to good from early principle or instilled opinion, when they grow ripe, must be MONSTERS indeed; and it is to be feared the AGE OF MONSTERS is not far off*.

"Whence this impiety springs, by what means it gains ground among us, and how it may be remedied, are matters that deserve the attention of all those who have the POWER AND THE WILL TO SERVE THEIR

* What were Robespierre, Marat, &c.?

COUNTRY.

COUNTRY. And although many things look like a prelude to some GENERAL RUIN, although it is much to be apprehended that we shall be *worse* before we are *better*, yet who knows what may ensue, if all PERSONS IN POWER would behave themselves like men truly conscious and mindful, that the authority they are clothed with is but a DERIVATIVE RAY FROM THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF HEAVEN? This may not a little contribute to stem that torrent which, from small beginnings, hath grown to such a head, and daily gathers force to such a degree, as threatens a general inundation and DESTRUCTION OF THESE REALMS.

"It would be great rashness," says DR. HARTLEY, whose ideas coincide with those of the Bishop, "to fix a time for the breaking of the storm that hangs over our heads: as it is blindness and infatuation not to see it; not to be aware that it *may* break. And yet this *infatuation* has always attend-

ed

ed all FALLING STATES The kingdoms of Judah and Israel, which are the types of all the rest, were thus infatuated. And CHRISTENDOM IN GENERAL seems ready to assume to itself the place and lot of the Jews, after they had REJECTED THEIR MESSIAH. Let no one deceive himself or others The PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE WORLD ARE EXTRAORDINARY AND CRITICAL BEYOND WHAT HAS EVER YET HAPPENED."

Both the writers here cited, were men of singular sagacity: and the events that have lately taken place respecting NATIONAL MORALS and RELIGION, in countries which used to be called *Christendom*, prove, that strong reason, assisted by experience and observation, becomes in such men almost PROPHETIC.

That the present calamities of the world are derived from the neglect and contempt of the Christian religion, is an opinion perfectly consistent with Scripture. That greater

greater than have yet been experienced may be dreaded, from the REJECTION OF THE MESSIAH, (whether practical or speculative,) there is every reason to think, on the supposition that Christianity is true.

In this book I have endeavoured to maintain a due sense of the real dignity and importance of the most solemn act of our worship, and the most sacred rite of our religion. I have been particularly careful to confirm my opinions by the authority of Scripture, and the sanction of pious and learned defenders of the faith, from the earliest ages, to the times in which we live. I have certainly given long and great attention to the subject; and am not without hope that I shall afford some information to those who, for want of leisure, or opportunity, or inclination, have hitherto little considered or understood the nature and efficacy of the Eucharist. If I should be so successful, I shall be reward-

ed

ed with the satisfaction of knowing that I shall have contributed to the permanent happiness of my fellow creatures, and the real welfare of my country.

That many persons who pretend to a superior share of the rational faculty, and of, what they call, LIBERALITY OF SENTIMENT, will be displeased with, or disposed to despise, both the Subject and Doctrine of my book, I foresee and lament; but I have not so learned Christ, as to be deterred from preaching and teaching what I conceive to be his Gospel, by obloquy, misrepresentation, or any other evil. I wish those who oppose salutary truth a better mind; and rest with cheerfulness under the satisfaction arising from a heart, in every doctrine and opinion advanced by me, conscious of universal benevolence.

I must not, in Justice to my book, omit to insert here a testimony in its favour from a Charge of SAMUEL HORSLEY, LL.D.

LL.D. late BISHOP OF ROCHESTER; a prelate, who is acknowledged by all parties to have been one of the ablest and most learned Theologists of the times, and to have done honour, by his SUPERIOR KNOWLEDGE, to his See, and to Episcopacy. The following recommendation of this treatise he delivered to his Clergy, from the altar of Tunbridge Church, as well as from those of the other Churches in his Diocese, at which he held his second General Visitation; and he afterwards published it at their desire *.

"It is with much satisfaction that I re-
"commend to your perusal, a Work not
"long since published upon this SUBLIME
"SUBJECT by a learned Divine of this
"Diocese, under the title of "Consider-
"ations on the Nature and Efficacy of the
"Lord's Supper." I have requested the
"reverend Author to reduce it to a form

* Vide page 28, 29. Quarto Edit. printed for James Robson, New Bond street, London.

"and

" and size fit for general dispersion among " the Laity, which I mean to recom- " mend. Mean while it highly deserves " the attention of the PROFESSION, to " whose *particular use* it is perhaps better " adapted in its present shape than in one " more popular; and it is no inconsider- " able monument of the learning and " Piety of the Writer."

I apologize for the introduction of a passage so highly laudatory; but it is admitted with less reluctance, as it gives me an opportunity of mentioning, with respect and gratitude, the name of a most distinguished Divine, a KIND, FRANK, GENEROUS and MANLY PRELATE, who in consequence of this book, honoured me with his unsolicited friendship and voluntary correspondence.

CONTENTS.

Sect.		Page
I.	Introductory. —	1
II.	The Sacrament in general, and the word Sacrament in particular, considered.	8
III.	Passages from late Writers, which degrade the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with Remarks.	14
IV.	The Opinion that the Eucharist is a mere Memorial, considered. —	21
V.	The Sixth Chapter of St. John contains Passages (*from verse* 25 *to verse* 36, *and from verse* 46 *to verse* 64) which refer to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. —	31
VI.	The Lord's Supper considered as *a Feast on, or after, a Sacrifice.* —	40
VII.	*Dr Cudworth's account of the Lord's Supper.* "The Lord's Supper in the Christian Church "in Reference to the true Sacrifice of "Christ, is a Parallel to the Feasts upon "Sacrifices, both in the Jewish Religion "and the Heathenish Superstition."	47
VIII.	*Bishop Warburton's* Opinion of the *Specific Nature* of the Lord's Supper.	52
IX.	Though the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be strictly a Feast on, or after, a Sacrifice; yet in popular Language, and *catachrestically*,	

or

SECT. Page

or by an allowed abuse of Terms,—a common figure of speech,—it has been, and may still be, called, a *Sacrifice*.—*Jesus Christ once offered on the Cross* is the *only Christian Sacrifice*. — — 66

X. That the present Benefits of the Eucharist are *Grace* and *Pardon*, is a Conclusion that must follow from admitting that the Sixth Chapter of St. John relates to it :—additional Reasons for thinking that the Expressions of this Chapter, already mentioned, mean much more than *Doctrines* and *Precepts*. — — — 75

XI. The primary and most important Benefit annexed to the worthy Reception of the Eucharist, is a Vouchsafement of Grace in *more Abundance than ordinary*, from which, of course, flow other Benefits, necessary to the Christian Life. — — 84

XII. Christ's more intimate dwelling with us, or our Participation of his Divine Nature considered, as an Effect of, and Benefit annexed to, worthily receiving the Lord's Supper. — — — 95

XIII. Union with Christ farther considered. 106

XIV. Remission of Sins more particularly considered as a present Benefit, annexed to the Eucharist. — — 114

XV. The *antient Liturgies*, still extant, prove that the primitive Christians, who were probably instructed by uninterrupted *Tradition* from the Apostles, considered the Eucharist, with respect to the *Benefits* annexed to it, in the same Light as it is represented in this Treatise. — — 125

The

SECT. Page

XVI. The Doctrine of Remission of Sins, in and by the Eucharist, not an Encouragement to Vice, but an Incitement to Virtue. 135

XVII. The Clause in the Lord's Prayer, "Give "us this Day our daily Bread," has a Reference to the Eucharist; and the Clause, "Forgive us our trespasses, as "we forgive them that trespass against "us," a similar Reference; both together include the two great Benefits annexed to the Sacrament, *Grace, and the Remission of Sins.* — — 151

XVIII. Farther Considerations on understanding the Petition for Bread, in the Lord's Prayer, to mean the Bread of Life, spoken of in St. John's Sixth Chapter,— that is, the Bread of the Eucharist, or the Divine Influence. — — 170

XIX. The Expressions of Body and Blood, as used by our Saviour, in the Institution of this Ordinance, not harsh and uncouth Figures to those who consider the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as a Feast on a Sacrifice. — — 187

XX. Of the true Knowledge of Christ attained in worthily receiving the Sacrament, by the unlearned and well-disposed Christian. 189

XXI. The Love of Christ to Man, of Man to Christ, and of Man to Man, strikingly exhibited in the Eucharist duly celebrated. — — — 203

XXII. Of the Opinion that the *positive* Duties of Christianity

SECT. Page

Christianity may be neglected, without incurring Blame, by those who observe the *Moral* Duties. — — 216

XXIII. The Observation of Ritual Ordinances, conducive, in a high Degree, to the Salutary Purposes of Religion. — 223

XXIV. Of the Attempts of learned Divines of the Church of England to disprove the *Necessity* of *Preparation* for the Sacrament; or to render it slight and superficial. 235

XXV. The Necessity and Propriety of Preparation for the Sacrament; with a few Suggestions on the Means. 247

XXVI. The Obligation to Frequency of Communion considered. — — 254

XXVII. Of administering the Sacrament to the Sick and Dying. 261

XXVIII. The small Number of Persons, comparatively speaking, who receive the Sacrament throughout a Country, like our own, professing Christianity. 267

XXIX. Of communicating internally, or spiritually, in *private*, in certain Cases of *Necessity*. — — 278

XXX. The Spirit and Circumstances of the present Times render Zeal and Diligence in defending and diffusing the great and mysterious Doctrines of Christianity peculiarly expedient. — 283

XXXI. Of the Church, as distinguished from the *World*; and the Expediency of preserving our union with the *Church* by Sacramental Communion. — 294

XXXII. The Idea erroneous, that the Maintenance of

Page
of the Dignity of the Catholic Church and the Rites of Christianity is unfavourable to civil Liberty. — 307
CONCLUSION. — 315

APPENDIX.

No. I. The Institution of this Sacrament by Christ as recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul. 335
No. II. The Passages in the Sixth Chapter of the Gospel of St. John, referred to in the "*Considerations.*" — — 337
No. III. An *Examination* of Young Persons, and of others who may require it, before receiving the Holy Sacrament, from Bishop Wilson's *Parochialia:* with Alterations. — 341
No. IV. Prayers composed and used by Samuel Johnson, LL. D. in his Preparation for receiving the Sacrament, at the Festival of Easter. 350
No. V. *Prayers* to be used in Preparation for the *Sacrament*, from Bishop *Wilson.* — 355
No. VI. *Devotional Assistance* for the Communion, from *Bishop Ken:* with Alterations. — 361

ERRATA TYPOGRAPHICA.

9	for "Traslators" read "Translators."
45	for "*on*" the sacrifice, read "*in*."
74	in the Note, dele "Great," which is repeated.
79	for "Hoadley," read "Hoadly."
84	in the Note, for "juntaxat," read "duntaxat."
105	in the Note, for "κειου" read "κει ου."
113	in the Note, for "ΨΑΓΕ" read "ΦΑΓΕ."
128	in the Note, for "να" read "Ινα" and for "κρισιν" read "αφεσιν."
151	dele "*to strengthen us in future*" and "Past."
161	in the Note, for "ΑΜΥΤΕΤΟΙ" read "ΑΜΥΤΗΤΟΙ."
163	for "previous" read "previously."
183	in the Note, for "Hebæorum" read "Hebræorum.'
206	line 8, insert "in."
208	in the Note, for "Insence" read "Incence."
221	for "Polution" read "Pollution."
245	in the Note, for "οκιμαξειν" read "δοκιμαξειν."
253	in the Note, for "Θεος ους" read "Θεους" also, for an indistinct Mark, read "Actus."
263	line 16, read "common."
271	for "Treaties" read "Treatises."
305	line 20, dele(:) and insert (?)
315	line 4, insert (,) after "many."
325	line 21, insert (,) after "adherence."

*** *Cum paucis aliis, quorum Causa fuit Auctoris a Prælo distantia, et quæ Lector benevolus, nullo Negotio, corriget.*

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

NATURE AND EFFICACY

OF THE

LORD'S SUPPER.

SECTION I.

INTRODUCTORY.

THERE is reason to believe that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper may be worthily received, and its benefits fully enjoyed, by all persons of good dispositions, though they should not be furnished with clear and precise ideas of its nature. Nevertheless it is desirable, for the sake of avoiding both carelessness and superstition, that right notions of it should be disseminated, if possible, among all classes of the people. This indeed is now become more expedient than ever, since divines of high rank in the Church, and of great re-

putation in letters, have lately employed their talents in detracting from its dignity, and in denying or extenuating its use. Of this conduct, which I cannot but call, in the gentlest terms, imprudent and pernicious, Bishop Hoadly gave the example. No book indeed was ever more completely answered, than the *Plain Account* of the Sacrament written by this celebrated prelate. The victory of his opponents was undisputed, and the book condemned to oblivion by the public voice. But its doctrines have been recently revived, and, by a peculiar mode of publication, obtruded on the notice of the common people. A large volume filled with dull debate, depreciating the Sacrament, is not likely to be called for by the unlearned: therefore, lest the important discoveries, originally published in such a volume, should remain unnoticed, its essence is extracted by its author, and charitably vended in a pamphlet of few pages, for the accommodation of the poor and needy *.

* See Dr. Bell's Practical Enquiry, price four-pence, an abridgment of his *volume* on the Sacrament, adapted to poor and pious Persons as a *manual* or *guide* to the Altar.

I engage

I engage in no personal controversy. But I express a strong sentiment of disapprobation, that some of the learned, who, as ecclesiastics, were bound to defend the doctrines to which they had solemnly assented, have joined the Socinians in derogating from the most sacred and important rite of our Religion. I deplore their error, and, as far as I am able, will counteract its effects. In the progress of my attempt, I shall have occasion to quote some passages from their writings; and, from these it will appear that every faithful member of the Church, every sincere believer of Christianity, is bound to discourage, as far as his influence extends, the prevalence of their degrading doctrine. I acquit the writers of all malice. They may be actuated by the love of singularity, they may be secretly inclined to infidelity, they may be disguised enemies of the Establishment, of which they are members, and thus endeavour to sap its foundation; but I judge them not: to Heaven are their motives known; be it mine merely to remonstrate against their

opinions on the Sacrament, as the opinions of fallible men, doing involuntary mischief from mistake.

The tide of the times runs strongly against every thing mysterious in Christianity; and the efforts of these professed friends to it, who endeavour to diffuse among the common people, low ideas of the Sacrament, increase the rapidity of the torrent. Their books are eagerly seized, praised, and laughed at by the Socinian, the sceptic, and the infidel; each of whom rejoices to see his cause promoted by persons whose duty and profession should lead them to oppose it, with weapons furnished from the united armouries of Reason and Scripture. Infidelity cannot fail to gain ground, when the constituted Guardians of the Faith are thus eager to surrender the citadel, without even the formality of a siege. Champions of the Church have struck their flag without a summons; and granted lavishly where concession was scarcely demanded.

But it is obvious to observe that, the manners and temper of the age render all the recent endeavours to lower the mysterious

rious rites of the Christian Religion more than ever injurious. Amidst the diffusion of general knowledge, there now prevails a *conceited fastidiousness* which leads the minds of many, inflated with the pride of *superficial* attainments, to the rejection or diminution of all ecclesiastical authority. At such a period, nothing is allowed to become venerable by the lapse of time; nothing is secured from assault by the high character of the Institutor; all ancient opinions and practices are examined at the bar of private judgment; the reason of every individual is rendered the standard of right reason; and human judgment is presumed to be a criterion of truth, perfect in its kind, and universal in its application.

In science and philosophy, in the business of the world, in the common intercourse of human life, reason is, for the most part, a guide sufficiently sure. But the mysteries of Religion are in their nature above reason; and it is a proof of human folly, as well as pride, to demand that the dispensations of the CREATOR should be all explicable by the reason of

a CREATURE—of a creature no less limited in his faculties, than in the term of his mortal existence.

If men give up all pretensions to belief of Christianity, they may then indeed assert, consistently with their folly, the omnipotence of human reason; but while they profess the Gospel, they must, if they would retain consistency, submit their reason to their Religion; for the whole doctrinal part of Christianity is a mystery. Is not the boasted Religion of Nature also mysterious? Can Reason account for Creation any more than for Redemption?

But I am now to consider, not the general mystery of Christianity, but the particular mystery of the Lord's Supper.

The church-men, who, deserting to the Socinian party, endeavour to degrade this mysterious rite, use the three following means in accomplishing their purpose: first, they represent the whole of it as a mere memorial; secondly, they deny or explain away all present benefits annexed to it; and, thirdly, they maintain, either that no preparation is necessary, or, that a slight one is sufficient; such as may be made

made in the Church during the time of celebration, or a few minutes before it.

I shall endeavour to make it appear, that the Eucharist, though a memorial, is, at the same time, much more than a memorial; that its benefits are present and unspeakably great, and that, in order to the reception of its benefits, peculiar care should be taken in the preparation.

SECTION II.

The Sacrament in general, and the word Sacrament in particular, considered.

THE all-wise Governor of the universe, knowing what is in man, and condescending to his infirmities, has not accommodated his Holy Ordinances to the intellectual improvements of a few only of the human race; but adapted them to the great mass of mortals, immersed in sensual things, prone to acquiesce in mere animal life, and with difficulty perceiving and admitting the pure and exalted truths of Religion. The rites which he has instituted are accompanied with sensible images, with objects visible and tangible, in order to conduct the carnal mind, by gentle gradations and in the easiest manner, to the sublimity of a spiritual and celestial state.

For this purpose, he has appointed two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in which the elements of water, bread, and wine, are constituted, under the operation

tion of his Spirit, both * signs and means of sanctification and pardon. In these mysterious institutions something is to be done as well as spoken; some palpable signs are introduced; and the language of actions and signs is a language more impressive and universal than any mode of oral utterance.

The word Sacrament, which distinguishes these Holy Rites, is certainly not a scriptural term, neither is it classical; for I do not accord with those who derive it from Sacramentum, the military oath of the Romans. It evidently comes from Sacramentum, as used by the early traslators of the Bible, in the edition called the Vulgate, whenever they had occasion to render into Latin the Greek term, Mystery †.

The very name Sacrament implies mystery. In the language of theologists, who,

* EFFICIUNT QUOD SIGNIFICANT. "Sacramentum est sacræ Rei Signum; ita ut *Imaginem* gerat, et "*Causa* existat." Heskins, Cap. xv. Lib. iii. p. 270.

† In the VULGATE are the following passages, where SACRAMENTUM is used for *Arcanum* et *Mysterium*:

	C.	V.	
DAN.	2.	18.	Ut quærerent misericordiam super *sacramento* isto.
		30.	*Sacramentum* hoc revelatum est.
		47.	Tu potuisti aperire hoc *sacramentum*.

DAN.

who, more intent on things than words, did not always study the purest diction of the Augustan age, Sacramentum is adopted as the appropriate name for the Holy Mysteries of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and accordingly our Church, in the Communion Service, announces, "that our "Master and only Saviour hath instituted "and ordained Holy Mysteries as pledges "of his love, and for a continual remem- "brance of his death, to our great and "endless comfort."

	C.	V.	
DAN.	4.	6.	Omne *sacramentum* non est impossibile tibi.
EPHES.	1.	9.	Ut notum faceret nobis *sacramentum* voluntatis tuæ.
	3.	3.	Notum mihi factum est *sacramentum.*
		9.	Dispensatio *sacramenti* absconditi a seculis in Deo.
	3.	32.	*Sacramentum* hoc magnum est.
COLOSS.	1.	27.	Divitias gloriæ *sacrimenti* hujus in gentibus.
1 TIM.	3.	16.	Et manifestè magnum est pietatis *sacramentum.*
APOC.	1.	10.	*Sacramentum* septem stellarum.

The word *Sacramentum* is used also in the same signification, that is, for "secret," and "mystery," in the Vulgate Apochrypha; but in none of these places has it the least reference to the *military oath* of the Romans. Neither has the name *Sacrament* been given by the Church to the Eucharist, or to Baptism, as signifying an OATH of Fidelity.

"These," says Dr. Isaac Barrow, "are called Sacraments for no other reason, than because the most ancient translators of the Bible into Latin, usually rendered the word μυστηριον, Mysterium, by the word Sacramentum."

Tertullian calls the whole of Christianity, "the *Sacrament*, that is, the Mystery, of the Christian religion."

Of

Of the two Sacraments or Mysteries, it is my present purpose to consider the second; the second in order of time, but the first in importance: I mean the Eucharist; that Sacrament which is occasionally to repair, while life continues, whatever is lost by sin and infirmity, after the initiation of Baptism; and to supply the Christian Pilgrim, in his journey through life, along the path of piety; with food for his growth in grace, with medicine for his maladies, and with a never-failing cup of holy consolation.

The Sacrament, for so the Eucharist is usually called by way of eminence, is both in its name and nature a mystery; and, as a mystery, it contains something in it above, though not contrary to, human reason; something supernatural, which can be nothing less than, as the Church expresses it, an inward and spiritual grace; the consequence of which must be the pardon of sin.

Sanctification * and the remission of sins are

* "Such Sanctification carries with it all that the Scriptures reckon among the fruits of the Spirit; as enriching the Soul;

are without doubt the greatest favors that a human being can receive, and these are offered in the Eucharist to the worthy receiver, by the Founder of our Religion and the Institutor of this rite. With the lowliest prostration, therefore, of mind and body, man, wretched as he is by nature, ought to approach the Holy Mystery, and accept the blessings of grace. Not that he is to worship any created thing in performing this solemn act; but that the deepest humility, as well as gratitude, is the proper sentiment of so weak a being, when he prepares to supplicate, according to a rite ordained by his Saviour, for grace and pardon at the throne of the Most High.

Unworthy the dignity and sanctity of this mysterious rite must be the ideas of all converts to the opinions of Dr. Bell, who teaches, "That the Lord's "Supper is a rite of the simplest and

Soul; and likewise, all that concerns the immortalizing of the Body, and sealing the *whole* man to future glory. All these blessings and privileges are conferred in the Eucharist on them who receive *worthily*; because the Spirit is conferred in it, who is the Fountain of them all, and whose *gracious* Presence supports them."—Dr. Waterland on the Eucharist, p. 378.

"plainest

" plainest nature, perfectly intelligible to " every capacity*; that it is simply a me- " morial of our Lord, but more especially " of his death and the general purpose for " which he died, having no other benefits " annexed to the celebration, nor any " other evils to the omission of it, than " those necessarily attending the celebra- " tion or omission of any other positive " rite under the Christian dispensation†." The reception of the Lord's Supper, according to this teacher, is no more than an act of obedience; the omission, than an act of disobedience. It is, according to him, a mere memorial without present benefits peculiar to it, and therefore ought to be degraded from that high rank in which it has ever been held by the Church, and is still, I trust, held by a great majority of Christians in every part of Christendom.

I shall endeavour to maintain the dignity of this Sacrament thus vilified, and to show that present benefits are annexed to it, not merely as to an act of obedience, but as to a holy mystery, by the appointment of Christ, efficacious, in the highest degree, on the soul of man.

* Practical Enquiry, p. 21. † Ibid. p. 34.

SECT.

SECTION III.

Passages from late Writers, which degrade the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with Remarks.

To justify my present attempt, I think it right to produce, in the commencement of it, a few passages from some very eminent divines, who have contributed to cause a neglect of the Sacrament by the low and degrading opinion of it which they have published and sanctioned under the authority of high rank and character.

Bishop Pearce, a grave and learned prelate, in a letter to Dr. Waterland, has these words: "You say the Eucharist "has graces and blessings annexed to it; "whereas, all that I say is, that it may "have them conveyed to the worthy re- "ceiver, but not annexed to their wor- "thily receiving." Again: "The Eucha- "rist has graces and blessings in common, "I think, with other acts of obedience

"unde

"under the Gospel, which shews that "I did not think these graces annexed to "the Eucharist, unless you will suppose "that they are annexed to all acts of obe- "dience, which you will not suppose, I "believe. The assistance of God's Spirit "is promised, in general, to all Christians; "and, therefore, I think, that in all acts "of religious worship, a devout Christian "may expect it; but I cannot see, from "any thing that you have advanced, that "he has a right or reason to expect, 'That "in the Eucharist pardon and grace are "annexed to worthy receiving.'"

Dr. Sykes says: "Our Saviour and his "Apostles mention no other ends of the "Sacrament than these two: to *comme-* "*morate* the death of Christ, and to be a "sign of friendship among Christians; "consequently, no other ends can be "made of the Lord's Supper, without "changing its institution, and making it "not the Lord's Supper, but our own "supper." This he says in a little cheap tract, intended for the multitude, and designed to prevent them from ex-

pecting

pecting present benefits from the Lord's Supper.

Another writer, Dr. Thomas Balguy, a man highly preferred in the Church, and remarkable for his refusal of the highest preferments of all, affirms, with decisive voice, that "the benefit is future and "prospective. Observe," says he, "these "benefits are not present, but future. "The benefit immediately obtained by "the Sacrament, is only the prospect of "salvation, (the only *grace* signified,) for- "cibly impressed on our minds by this "rite *."

Dr. Bell, whose little Tract I have had occasion to mention before, gives the following account of the BENEFITS annexed to the Eucharist†:

"All the benefits we are warranted in "expecting from this rite, are, first, that "approbation of God, which intentional "compliance with his will must certainly "procure; and, secondly, whatever addi-

* Dr. Balguy, Charge 7.

† Practical Enquiry, pages 17 and 21.

tional

" tional strength our principles may *natu-*
" *rally* acquire by the celebration of any
" religious rite itself.

" There neither are, nor CAN be, any
" other benefits attending the performance
" than these ; We have not," he proceeds,
" any promise, or even the slightest in-
" timation, either from our Lord him-
" self, or any of his Apostles, that the
" gracious influences of the Spirit are pe-
" culiarly conferred upon us on account
" of the celebration of the Lord's Sup-
" per *."

Again he says : " If ever the bread and
" wine are received, whether by the well,
" the sick, or the dying, as an appointed
" means of obtaining the remission of sins ;
" or in any other light than merely as an
" act of due obedience to a positive com-
" mand of our Lord, *naturally* expressive
" of faith in him, and when seriously
" performed as *naturally* conducive to all
" such dispositions as that faith requires,
" the participant is deceived, and the rite
" itself misapplied †.

* Page 28. † Page 30.

"THE LORD'S SUPPER IS SIMPLY A "MEMORIAL OF OUR LORD."

He sums up all, in his conclusion, by saying, "the Lord's Supper is a rite of the "simplest and plainest nature, perfectly "intelligible to every capacity; and the "performance of it is not attended with "any other benefits than those we our-"selves make it productive of, by its re-"ligious influence on our principles and "practice*."

If the whole of this account be true, the sentiment it excites is deep regret. Even the sick and dying can no longer expect a last solace from, what they deemed, a certain source of consolation. All those who have kindly, as well as devoutly, kneeled at the bed-side of departing sinners, held out the holy elements, and told them, that on receiving with faith and repentance, their sins would be forgiven, have, according to Dr. Bell, "*deceived* "*the poor communicant and misapplied the* "*holy rite.*" How can this opinion be re-

* Page 34.

conciled

conciled to a solemn approbation of the Liturgy?

No longer is the congregation to expect sanctifying grace; the influence of the Holy Spirit, from that solemn service, for which they have prepared with anxious hearts, and from which they were accustomed to return with souls strengthened and refreshed.

Nothing mysterious is allowed by this Author to be contained in the most solemn act of Christian devotion. Every thing is said to be perfectly plain in it, and intelligible to the meanest capacity. Thus all religious awe is at once removed, and the Christian is to go to the Eucharistical table with nearly the same freedom and familiarity as to the meal of which he daily partakes in the family or convivial circle.

There is nothing to induce men to receive the Sacrament, but a positive command, from an obedience to which he who gave it is represented, in the depreciating scheme, as not affording the slightest intimation of any PECULIAR BENEFIT.

It is a comfortless account. I am convinced

vinced it is not the true one; and think myself well employed in endeavouring to recommend those more exalted ideas of the Sacrament, which our forefathers adopted, and which contributed both to their own virtue and happiness, and to the general prevalence of the Christian Religion.

SECTION IV.

The Opinion that the Eucharist is a mere Memorial, considered.

THOUGH the opinion of Bishop Hoadly, 'that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper 'is but a mere memorial,' has been repeatedly refuted, yet is said to gain ground, and to be likely to prevail more and more, in an age when the whole of our Religion is represented by the Sect of self-named Rationalists, the modern Socinians, as totally devoid of every thing mysterious.

This notion that the Sacrament is a mere memorial, recommends itself, they argue, by its simplicity. Every body can understand what is meant by an act of commemoration. The idea is perfectly familiar. We keep a birth-day in our families, and we remember public events in anniversary festivals. To receive the Sacrament as a mere commemorative act, like

these in common life, requires no peculiar grace of Christianity, no examination of the heart, no preparatory discipline. The remembrance of a friend at a convivial table, is an act nearly as religious and virtuous as the reception of the Sacrament, according to the ideas of those who affirm that it is nothing more than an act of memory; performed with some formalities indeed, which, however, as far as any benefits to ourselves are to be received, might as well be omitted, if they had not been positively commanded. The Extenuators of the Sacrament sometimes suggest a hint that the command to perform this slight service may possibly not extend to us in these days, but might have been confined to the Apostles, to whom it was immediately given by the Institutor. Dr. Bell, whom I am sorry to quote so often, instructs his disciples thus: "Should any "one," says he, "be sincerely convinced "that the Lord's Supper was not instituted "for a standing rite of his religion, but "merely for the observance of the Apos-"tles themselves who were present at the "institution, *no punishment whatever* will "be

" be incurred by him for *omitting* to cele-
" brate it under this persuasion." This declaration, pronounced with the decision of a legislator, becomes not a weak mortal, when speaking of rewards and punishments to be bestowed by the Almighty: and I do not think it right to suggest to the *common people*, to whom his *little pamphlet* is addressed, excuses for neglecting the Sacrament, which, without any assistance, they are ready to fabricate. I venture to say that scarcely one in a thousand, among the unlearned, would ever have thought, without such a suggestion, that the command to celebrate the Sacrament could have been confined to he Apostles who heard it. May not many other precepts be supposed to concern only those who heard them, as well as this which respects the Sacrament?

The simplicity of the doctrine that the Eucharist is but an act of memory, and the facility of performing that act, may cause the depreciating accounts of the Sacrament to be well received in the busy world, where men think they have something else to do than to bestow much

time and thought on the concerns of Religion. They who are deeply immersed in the cares of ambition, avarice, or pleasure, may, without any great self-denial, spare a few moments to perform a duty so easy, and of so little moment as eating bread and drinking wine in an act of commemoration. The most thoughtless of mankind may stop a few moments to pick up straws from the surface of the stream; but they only, who are convinced that there is a pearl beneath will have resolution to dive to the bottom.

Persons, who are so far deluded as to acquiesce in the straws on the surface, while gold and jewels are attainable by a deeper research, may regret their delusion when they feel themselves, at some future period, totally destitute of the riches of grace. They may have to deplore their confidence in those teachers, who led them to believe that the Eucharist is nothing more than a commemorative rite, requiring no preparation, and followed with no present and appropriate advantage.

If the Holy Communion be a memorial only, then every man, who, without partaking

partaking of the bread and wine from the hand of the authorized minister, seriously and devoutly remembers our Saviour's death, in any place, or at any time, may excuse himself from coming to the table in the Church, even on the most solemn occasions, as from a work of superstition and superfluity. Or, if in compliance with a decorous custom, (in what he thinks matter of indifference,) he should sometimes attend it, he will go without hope, and return without consolation.

Is it necessary (the lukewarm and the busy may say) to go to Church to eat bread and drink wine, in order to call to remembrance a fact of universal notoriety? Who forgets the death of Cæsar? The death of Christ can never fall from the memory of a man who has read the Gospel, or who lives in a land where Christianity is the established Religion. The Sacrament, thus lowered from a beneficial mystery to a mere memorial, will scarcely be considered in any other light than as a relique of popery. Among the mass of the people it is already neglected; but if the doctrine taught

taught by distinguished divines, that it is but a ceremony without benefits, should prevail; the neglect of worthy receiving will not be apologized for, as the effect of thoughtlessness; but boldly defended, as displaying a mind superior to all idle and superstitious formality.

This degrading opinion has already been ably confuted; and, in this place, I shall add only one or two considerations on its absurdity; suggested by the learned author of the Divine Legation. He is an accurate reasoner; and I prefer his testimony, on the present occasion, because he was ingula ly adverse to every thing that bordered on fanaticism. He would not, I think, have maintained the mysterious dignity of the Eucharist, and the beneficial effects which attend it, unless he had been convinced of them by arguments of irresistible force.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is allowed to be more than a *memorial*, inasmuch as it is allowed to be a COMMUNION of the *Participants*, from the words which follow: "We being many, are one bread

"and

" and one body, for we are all partakers " of that one bread*." It is allowed, I say, in being a *Communion of the Participants*, to be something more than mere remembrance of a benefactor. It causes the receivers (as we here read) " of many to become one body." But if it be merely a Commemoration of a departed benefactor, the receivers are not made by it one body, but remain, as they were, separate professors of one common faith. They were connected in the circumstance of a common profession of faith, before they partook of the bread; and are not at all the more incorporated by a mere act of Commemoration, which each of them may *separately* perform, whether in solitude or in company. But by their " communion of " the body and blood" of Christ they become mystically UNITED to *each other* and to HIM; they become ONE BODY in a mystical Communion.

If the Sacrament had been the mere remembrance of a Benefactor, how could the crime of the Corinthians have been so

* 1 Cor. x.

great,

great, as to render them "guilty of the "body and blood of Jesus Christ*;" that is, involved in the guilt of his intentional murderers? "There was more in it than "a mere remembrance," says Bishop Warburton, "or St. Paul aggravates their crime." Was the festivity of the Corinthians, if carried even to some degree of excess, a crime so atrocious as to constitute them no less guilty than the murderers of Jesus Christ, when the very exuberance of their joy might arise from an overflowing gratitude to a Benefactor, at a feast appointed by himself, purposely for a chearful commemoration. They might have been guilty of very blamable irreverence and indecorum in their excess; but not guilty of a crime equal to the murder of our Saviour, unless there be something more in the feast which they profaned than mere remembrance. "To "rank these criminals," says the same able prelate, "with the murderers of the Lord "of Life, is a severity of which we can-"not see the justice.—But when we view

* 1 Cor. xi. 27.

"the

" the Sacrament as a feast, or rite, in " which the benefits of Christ's death and " passion were *conveyed*, and at the same " time *slighted* by the Corinthians, we " can then account for their criminality. " Slighting the benefits, was rendering, as " far as in them lay, the death and pas- " sion of Christ ineffectual, which was the " purpose of his murderers;" therefore the crime of the Corinthians, thus viewed, had a similarity to that of his murderers, and justly provoked the Apostle's indignation.

I suppose the modern degraders of the Sacrament will not deny, that St. Paul understood the nature and design of the Sacrament better than themselves; and it appears from his opinion of the Corinthian profanation, that he could not consider it as a mere memorial. No method of keeping a feast of simple commemoration could render the partakers equally guilty with those who crucified their Saviour; the crime which is implied in the words, " guilty of the body and blood of Jesus " Christ."

Without repeating all the arguments of those

those writers who answered Bishop Hoadly, I think it will appear from the following pages, that the Lord's Supper is attended with *present* benefits of the highest nature, and therefore cannot be a mere memorial, or a mere act of obedience, in which neither is the soul strengthened and refreshed, nor any inward and spiritual grace conferred. Strength, refreshment, and Divine assistance, are the benefits, which the CHURCH in her *Catechism*, founded on SCRIPTURE, (particularly, in this part, on the sixth chapter of St. John), teaches her children to expect from a worthy participation of the Lord's Supper; and they are benefits, which the pious, according to their own confessions, have in all ages experienced with joy * and gratitude.

* Mens deficit quam non recepta Eucharistia erigit et accendit. *Cyprian: Epist.* 54 *ad Corinth.*

SECT.

SECTION V.

The Sixth Chapter of St. John contains Passages (from verse 25 to verse 36, and from verse 46 to verse 64) *which refer to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

In the present discussion, I think it very material, that the passages respecting the eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man, in the sixth chapter of St. John, should be generally understood (as they were in my opinion certainly meant) to point out, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Eucharistical Feast on the ONE GREAT SACRIFICE.

I shall, therefore, for the sake of establishing so important an opinion, call in an auxiliary whose sermon on the subject is not more remarkable for the elegance of its composition, than its perspicuity and force, though I am aware the writer is on some occasions deemed obscure.

scure. I am myself convinced that the passages in question relate to the solemn feast of the Eucharist, which our Saviour afterwards instituted, and for which he gradually prepared the minds of his disciples, by this most remarkable discourse:

"With regard," says Bishop CLEAVER, "to the objection to the *sacramental construction* of these passages, (the passages in the sixth chapter of St. John), drawn from the *non-institution* of the Sacrament at *the time when this discourse was delivered*, I will only oppose to it one plain fact, which is this; that the same evangelist, St. John, has, in the third chapter of his Gospel, preserved a discourse of our Lord's with Nicodemus, which expressly mentions the sign and the thing signified, the necessity, and the good effects of BAPTISM, *long before* that Sacrament was instituted."

"There can, therefore, be no presumption drawn against the application of this chapter to the institution of the Lord's Supper, from the *time* when this discourse was delivered, which would not equally militate against the application of the third

third chapter to the Sacrament of Baptism; an application which is, notwithstanding, universally allowed. It should likewise be remembered by those who urge this objection, that the institution of Baptism, however early in the course of our Lord's ministry it was described and explained, was not enjoined till after this of our Lord's Supper."

"So much for the objection by itself considered; but I would make a further use of this discourse upon Baptism, between which and that under consideration, there is more than an accidental resemblance."

"Our Saviour had told Nicodemus that he must be born again; Nicodemus replies to the impossibility of the thing, in the obvious and literal sense of the words. Jesus in answer, with peculiar solemnity and claim to attention, points out the possibility and the means of being born again, as well as the necessity of such regeneration: "VERILY, VERILY, I say "unto you, except a man be born of "water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter "into the kingdom of God." To which,

still remarking on the want of apprehension of Nicodemus, he adds, "If I have "told you earthly things, and you believe "not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you "of heavenly things."

"In the sixth chapter Jesus had said, "The bread that I will give is my flesh, "which I will give for the life of the "world." The Jews again answering, as Nicodemus had done before, to the impossibility of the thing, in its literal sense, said, "How can this man give us his "flesh to eat." To which our Lord returns an answer, corresponding to that given to Nicodemus, even to the *very turn of the sentence:* "VERILY, VERILY, I say unto "you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son "of Man, and drink his blood, ye have "no life in you." The purport of which words is repeated and confirmed in the three next verses, to which he adds, still remarking on their want of apprehension, "Doth this offend you? What, and if ye "shall see the Son of Man ascend up "where he was before?" A reply so exactly *parallel* to that with which he had concluded his conversation with this Master

ter in Israel, that the bare *juxta-position* of these sentences will render each the comment upon the other. From which analogy, I cannot but think, that whoever will observe the style, manner, and connection of these two discourses, will be of opinion, that St. John took pains industriously to shew, that the two institutions, which were to distinguish this Religion, made part of our Saviour's plan *long before* they were actually enjoined. What confirms this notion is, that the only miracle which St. John relates after the other Evangelists, is this, of the miraculous increase of bread, a circumstance in itself highly remarkable, as the reason of it is obvious, because it gave an easy opportunity of introducing and explaining the nature of this Sacrament, as the occurrence relating to Nicodemus had afforded an opportunity of explaining the other. To which I must add, that he is the only Evangelist who insists upon the sacramental importance of either institution; and that his attention, in this instance, is perfectly consonant with the general design of his history, which was written in aid

of the other Evangelists, to supply such doctrines as he judged might be most usefully added, and at the same time, to correct the misrepresentations of some already received."

The learned Bishop proceeds to answer other objections in a manner equally able. He concludes a convincing discourse, with saying, "If we are justified in interpreting the words of this chapter, "He "that eateth my flesh and drinketh my "blood, dwelleth in me and I in him," directly of this Sacrament, this passage will have an important influence on forming our opinion respecting the PECULIAR BENEFITS arising from this institution, and we have only to inquire into the meaning of the words, "dwelleth in me and I "in him," to determine what these benefits precisely are.

"To dwell in Christ, therefore, is to live according to his commandments; to have Christ dwelling in *us*, is to enjoy the influence of his Holy Spirit.

"Thus St. John: "Hereby we know "that he abideth in us, by the Spirit that "he hath given us: again, hereby know "we

" we that we dwell in him, and he in us,
" because he hath given us of his Spirit."

" If then we rightly interpret the text, the assistances of the Spirit are directly annexed to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But the sanctification of the Spirit supposes Redemption and Pardon; which, therefore, might else from this chapter be proved a benefit consequent upon this ordinance. But as these truths may be more obviously and simply deduced from the words of the institution, and from the nature of the rite itself, I shall not insist at large upon the argument, but content myself with having shewn, in *opposition* to those who have interpreted the eating and drinking Christ's body and blood to be no more than *keeping his commandments*, that it alluded to something more analogous to the literal sense of the words: in *opposition* to those who interpret it only of the *thing signified* in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that it includes the *signs* also; without which the notion of spiritual manducation is unfounded, and the passage, both to Jew and Christian, inexplicable: in *opposi-*

tion to those who consider the Lord's Supper *simply as a remembrance* of his death, that it is a commemoration of the sacrifice for sin made by his death, and a symbolical feast upon a sacrifice; and is therefore a pledge and means of communicating to us all the benefits of that sacrifice."

Such is the opinion of this ingenious writer on these passages of St. John; and such also is, and was always, upon due consideration, mine. But though it is certainly proper to confute the erroneous interpretations of controversialists, who, from motives of religious *party*, have denied the reference of this chapter to the Sacrament, yet I cannot help observing, that scarcely any reader of common sense can doubt that the words, concerning eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, are to be applied to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. I venture to affirm, that they are now so understood by all who have not been misled by the perusal of partial commentators, leaders in the field of controversy; and I think the decisions of common sense in matters of which it is competent

competent to judge, are often more to be depended upon, as criterions of truth, than the refined speculations of men accustomed to dispute merely for the palm of victory. Such men have often divested DIVINITY of all its RELIGION.

I shall again have occasion briefly to consider the reference of the sixth chapter of St. John to the Sacrament, when I proceed more particularly to review the benefits annexed to the worthy reception of it *.

* "When St. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, "CHRIST, our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the FEAST," his words imply, that the Jewish Passover was a sacrifice and feast upon it, and that Christians have a Passover which resembles it:" that is, which is a FEAST UPON A SACRIFICE.—Dr. TOWNSON.

"We must not understand, in the Sacrament, the bare, naked, and empty *remembrance* of Christ's death, the calling to mind the *history* of his Passion, which the devils can do, and the *worst of men*: THUS to *remember* Christ, were but to FORGET him; but, we must understand a remembrance CUM EFFECTU; the *relying* on his death; with a *lively faith*, and the *applying* of his merits to our souls."—T. FULLER.

SECTION VI.

The Lord's Supper considered as A FEAST ON, OR AFTER, A SACRIFICE.

THAT the Lord's Supper is a feast on, or after, a sacrifice, is an explication of it which has been adopted by the ablest and most learned men. Dr. CUDWORTH, a great and venerable name, first suggested it in this country; and it has been firmly supported by the ingenious arguments of succeeding Divines. They have, indeed, given additional confirmation to it; but the honour of the original idea should, I think, be assigned to CUDWORTH alone.

From a close and impartial attention to his and their arguments, I am fully convinced, that the Eucharist is a *feast upon a sacrifice;* a feast after the GREAT SACRIFICE of all, even JESUS CHRIST upon the *Cross;* in which all other sacrifices, however various in their kind and modes, from

from the rising to the setting of the sun, were ordained to terminate.

But the Doctrine of the Sacrament, as a feast on, or after, a sacrifice, may not be obvious to the apprehension of the unlearned, who are no less deeply concerned in it than the best informed; and it should therefore be explained to them, in order to satisfy their minds, and facilitate its general adoption.

The death of Christ was a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, a sacrifice that comprehended in it, not only the commemorative oblation of the Pascal Lamb, but the other Jewish sacrifices, the *sin offering* and the *peace offering*. Like them it was to have a feast on, or after, it, and that feast is the Lord's Supper. The Heathens, as well as the Jews, had a feast after their sacrifices, and the partakers of the feast, in both cases, were to be partakers of the benefits supposed to redound from the sacrifice. "Are not "they which eat of the sacrifice," says Saint Paul, "partakers of the altar?" What then were the benefits of the Jewish sacrifices? of the sin offering, the benefit

was

was forgiveness of sins: of the peace offering, acceptance with God. The sacrifice of Christ on the Cross conveys, therefore, to those who partake in its benefits, by partaking of the feast instituted upon it, *pardon* of their sins and *acceptance* with God; which must include sanctification of their souls, or, as the Church expresses it, an inward and spiritual grace.

I proceed to mention, in a cursory manner, sufficient for my purpose, the Pagan sacrifices. The rites of the Pagan theology were derived from the Jews, though corrupted and distorted, and their original purpose lost and forgotten in the lapse of time. But the Pagans retained the practice of feasting after a sacrifice, that is, of eating a part of the victim offered, in order to partake of the propitiation supposed to be effected by the sacrifice.

It would be tedious to recite passages from the ancient writers to confirm this assertion. The first book of Homer affords a proof of it. The fact is well known, even to school-boys, and wants not additional confirmation.

Here then are three kinds of sacrifices at

at present under our view, the Jewish, the Gentile, and the Christian; not comparable indeed in their dignity, but parallel in the circumstance of a *feast after each*, and in the general purpose of propitiating the Deity. The eating of the oblation, after the Jewish and the Gentile sacrifice, rendered (in the opinion of the sacrificers) the partakers of the *repast* partakers of the *benefits* of the sacrifice. The partaking of the feast, after the grand Christian sacrifice, is also a participation in it, and confers all its advantages. The Eucharist is this feast, this *epulum sacrificiale;* to be repeated, while the world endures, after the great sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; which itself is never to be repeated, but the benefits of which are to flow by means of the feast upon it, as from a perennial fountain, till time shall be no more.

It is very important that the Eucharist should be considered, as it appears really to be, a feast on, or after, a sacrifice; for this idea comprehends in it a right notion of our Saviour's death upon the Cross; that *sacrifice* which gave rise to the feast, without which, according to analogy, the sacrifice

sacrifice itself would be incomplete. It teaches this most important truth, that our Saviour himself declared his death to be a sacrifice. The sacrifice, however, is nothing to us till we partake in the feast upon it. We are but idle by-standers, or uninterested spectators, till we WORTHILY eat of those symbols which are appointed to be in the place of the slaughtered victim, once offered; a view of the subject this, which should make every real Christian shudder at the idea of wilfully and entirely neglecting, through life, the Holy Communion.

The sacrifice of Christ, without participants in the feast on, or after it, is merely a violent death inflicted on the Holy Person commemorated; and ceases to be a complete sacrifice, or to confer any benefits at all, so far as the *non-participants* in the FEAST are concerned. They can have no advantage from a Sacrifice, of which they do not partake; but must be saved, if saved at all, by the extraordinary interposition of Divine Mercy, acting independently of the Christian dispensation.

Divines, it is true, have offered to the world

world *Plain Accounts* and *Practical Accounts* of the Sacrament, according to which the Scriptural expressions of eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ are so far from being either *plain* or *practical*, that they appear monstrous and irrational in the highest degree. What has eating the body or drinking the blood to do with a mere act of the memory? They are conscious of this *irrelevancy*, and therefore do not chuse to admit the Sacramental construction of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel.

The *plainest* and most *rational* account of the Sacrament, that I know of, is that which describes it as a FEAST ON OR AFTER A SACRIFICE. The eating of the body, and drinking of the blood of the victim, are expressions, when the general nature of sacrifices is once explained, perfectly intelligible; and the feast on the OBLATION of the real body and blood is well emblematized by the bread and wine. It is obvious to remark that the real victim on the Sacrifice, could not in this case, even for *once*, have afforded a real feast, much less a feast to be repeated all over Christendom, till the second advent,

when

when all signs, symbols, types and shadows, shall be superseded by a personal presence, by a substantial form, by a body glorified beyond all power, not only of description, but of imagination.

From the doctrine that we cannot enjoy the benefits of the sacrifices, without being participants of the feast after it, we may understand the awful words of our Saviour: "Verily, verily," (a most solemn asseveration,) "I say unto you, except ye "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and "drink his blood, ye can have no life in "you*;" that is, 'I positively declare to you that unless you partake of the *sacrifice* of myself, by partaking of the feast that I shall institute upon it, ye cannot share the benefits which that sacrifice was intended to confer; even LIFE, spiritual life, and life eternal. "Except you eat of this bread, and drink of this wine, ye have no life in you." Words too strong and too alarming to be lightly passed over by those who are sincere in their profession of Christianity; and yet words of comfort to those who understand them of the eucharistical bread and wine.

* John, vi.

SECT.

SECTION VII.

Dr. CUDWORTH'S account of the LORD'S SUPPER.

" *The Lord's Supper in the Christian Church*
" *in Reference to the true Sacrifice of*
" *Christ, is a Parallel to the Feasts upon*
" *Sacrifices, both in the Jewish Religion*
" *and the Heathenish Superstition.*"

" LEST," says Dr. Cudworth, " we should seem all this while to set up fancies of our own, and then sport with them; we come now to DEMONSTRATE and evince that the Lord's Supper, in the proper notion of it, is EPULUM EX OBLATIS, or a Feast upon Sacrifice, in the same manner with the Feasts upon the Jewish Sacrifices under the Law, and the Feasts upon ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΑ, things offered up to Idols among the Heathens; and that from a place of Scripture where all these three shall be compared together, and made exact

exact parallels. 1 Corinth. chap. x, verses 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21. "Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from Idolatry. I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say—the Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?—Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the Sacrifices partakers of the Altar?—Now, I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice unto Devils, and not to God, and I would not that ye should have fellowship with Devils—Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table and the Table of Devils."

Where the Apostle's scope being to convince the Corinthians of the unlawfulness of eating things sacrificed to Idols, he doth it in this manner; shweing that though an Idol were truly nothing, and things sacrificed to Idols were physically nothing, as different from other meats, (as it seems they argued, and St. Paul confesses in the nineteenth verse), yet morally and

and circumstantially, to eat of things *sacrificed* to *Idols* in the *Idols Temple*, was to CONSENT with the Sacrifices and to be guilty of them.

Which he illustrates, FIRST, from a parallel Rite in the *Christian Religion*, where the eating and drinking of the Body and Blood of Christ, OFFERED upon the CROSS, is a *real Communication* in his Death and Sacrifice; "The cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?"

SECONDLY, from another parallel of the same Rite among the *Jews*, where always they that eat of the Sacrifices were partakers of the Altar, that is, of the Sacrifice offered up *upon* the Altar. "Behold Israel after the flesh (that is, the Jews); are not they which eat of the Sacrifices, partakers of the Altar?"

"In veteri Lege, quicunque admitte-
"bantur ad edendum de Hostiis oblatis,
"censebantur ipsius Sacrificii, tanquam
"pro ipsis oblati, fieri participes et per

"illud sanctificari;" as a late Commentator fully expresses it.

THEREFORE, as to eat the Body and Blood of Christ, in the Lord's Supper, is to be made partakers of his SACRIFICE offered up to God for us;—as to eat of the Jewish Sacrifices, under the *Law*, was to partake of the *legal* Sacrifices themselves; so to eat of things offered up in Sacrifice to *Idols* was to be made partakers of the Idol Sacrifices, and thtrefore was unlawful.

For, "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils." But Christ's Body and Blood were offered up in Sacrifice unto God, and therefore they could not partake of *both together*; the Sacrifice of the true God and the Sacrifice to Devils (Demons.) "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils; ye cannot be partakers of the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils."

St. Paul's argument here must needs suppose a PERFECT ANALOGY between these *three*; and that they are all *parallels* to one another, or else it hath NO STRENGTH.

WHERE-

WHEREFORE, I conclude from hence: that the LORD'S SUPPER is the same among *Christians* in respect of the *Christian Sacrifice* (Christ once offered on the Cross) that among the *Jews*, the FEASTS upon the legal Sacrifices were; and among the *Gentiles* the Feasts upon the *Idol* Sacrifices;—and *therefore* that (the Eucharist or Lord's Supper among Christians) is EPULUM SACRIFICIALE or EPULUM EX OBLATIS—a Feast upon a Sacrifice, or a Feast upon the Oblation or the things offered in Sacrifice *," which, in this case, were the real Body and Blood of Christ, originally and now represented by the Bread and the Wine in the Eucharist.

* Vid. *A Discourse concerning the true Notion of the Lord's Supper.* By R. Curdworth, D. D. The second edition, 1670.

SECTION VIII.

Bishop Warburton's *Opinion of the* Specific Nature *of the Lord's Supper.*

"The celebration of the Lord's Supper being our *constant duty*, as it is to "shew the Lord's death till he come;" and likewise our *greatest interest*, as it is the "communion of the body and blood of Christ;" it may not be improper to enquire into its *Specific Nature*; in order to comprehend both the force of our obligation to frequent the Lord's table, and the value of that benefit we receive in worthily communicating.

The history of its institution is delivered by St. Matthew, in these words, "And "as they were eating, Jesus took bread "and blessed it, and brake it, and gave "it to the Disciples, and said, Take eat; "This is my Body: and he took the cup "and gave thanks, and gave it to them, "saying,

" saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my " Blood of the New Testament, which is " shed for many for the remission of " Sins."

The Rites and Ceremonies of the law were *Typical.* A *type*, as hath been shewn elsewhere, arose from the ancient mode of conversing by *signs:* for, by adding a *moral import* to a significative sign, the action becomes a *Type.* This sacred Rite which (together with Baptism) was to take place of the whole Jewish ritual, is, like that ritual, *Typical* also; but with this difference: the Jewish Rites were predictive of things *future;* and so were obscure and intricate: this, significative of a thing *past;* and so, clear and intelligible.

Thus far as to its *form.* Its *Specific Nature* will be our next inquiry. To have an exact idea of this, two things must be well considered: The state of Religion at the time this Rite was instituted, and the particular season in which it was celebrated.

In those ages of the world when victims made so great a part of Religion,

both of Jews and Gentiles, the *sacrifice* was always followed by a religious feasting on the thing offered; which was called, the feast *upon, or after the sacrifice;* the partakers of which feast were supposed to become partakers of the *benefits* of the sacrifice. Now, from the Gospel history of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and from St. Paul's reasoning upon it, a celebrated person hath long since shewn, with great compass of learning, and force of argument, that Jesus, about to offer himself a sacrifice on the cross for our redemption, did, in conformity to a general practice, institute the Last Supper, under the idea of a feast after the sacrifice. So far that learned writer, CUDWORTH.

As to the particular *season* in which this holy Rite was celebrated; we are to consider, that the *great Sacrifice* of the Cross was typically prefigured by several of the Temple Oblations, and especially by the Paschal-Lamb. Now just before the Passion, and while Jesus was eating the Paschal-Supper, which was a Jewish feast after or upon the sacrifice, he institutes this holy Rite. And as it was his general

general custom to allude, in his actions and expressions, to what passed before his eyes, or presented itself to his observation; who can doubt, when we see, in the very form of celebration, all the marks of a *sacrificial Supper*, but that the Divine Institutor intended it should bear the same relation to his Sacrifice on the Cross, which the Paschal-Supper, then celebrating, bore to the oblation of the Paschal-Lamb; that is, be of the nature of a feast after a sacrifice. For if this was not his purpose, and that no more was intended than a *general memorial*, or remembrance of a dead benefactor, why was this instant of time preferred to all other throughout the course of his ministry, any of which had been equally commodious?

This reasoning receives additional strength even from what hath been supposed to invalidate it, namely, the concluding words of the institution—"Do this in remembrance of me." For though these words, considered alone, might signify no more than the remembrance of our obligation to him in general; yet when pre-

ceded by—"this is my body—this is my blood"—they necessarily imply the remembrance of his death and passion for us, in *particular*. And could there be a feast after the sacrifice, in which that sacrifice was not commemorated?

It is true, the injunction of doing it in remembrance, implies, that the celebration was to be continually repeated; which was not the case of feasts after the sacrifice; on which, as we say, this holy Rite was modelled. But this was a necessary difference; for the great Sacrifice itself, of which this feast was a Type, differed in the same manner from all other sacrifices. The Jewish and Pagan oblations had, or were supposed to have, only a passing and temporary virtue. The Sacrifice on the Cross is of perpetual efficacy; and will continue to operate till the consummation of all things. It seemed fit, therefore, that the *operating virtue* of this Sacrifice should be perpetually set before us, in a constant celebration of the *feast upon it*.

We have now seen what may be naturally, and indeed, what must be reasonably inferred of Christ's purpose in the Last

Last Supper, from the history of its institution.

Let us try next what we can collect of St. Paul's sense, in this matter, who hath occasionally spoken at large concerning it. And here we shall find, that this very sort of feast, which the words of the institution tacitly allude to, St. Paul, in order to shew the Specific Nature of the Rite, expressly draws a comparison from; and at the same time, in order to shew the efficacy of it, informs us of the end and purpose of those feasts upon the Sacrifice.

It is, in that place of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, where he reproves the proselytes to Christianity for the idolatrous practice of eating with the Gentiles, of things offered to Idols, in their feasts upon the sacrifice. His words are these—"I "speak as to wise men; judge ye what I "say. The cup of blessing which we "bless, is it not the communion of the "blood of Christ? The bread which we "break, is it not the communion of the "body of Christ?—For we being many

"are

" are one bread and one body: for we
" are all partakers of that one bread.
" Behold Israel after the flesh: are not
" they which eat of the sacrifices partakers
" of the Altar? What say I then? That
" an idol is any thing, or that which is
" offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing?
" But I say, that the things which the
" Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to de-
" vils, and not to God: and I would not
" that ye should have fellowship with
" devils; ye cannot drink the cup of the
" Lord, and the cup of devils; ye can-
" not be partakers of the Lord's Table,
" and of the table of devils."

The Apostle professeth, in this place, to write to these Corinthians under their assumed character of *wise men*. And though perhaps he may use the term a little ironically, and in reproof of the divisions, before objected to them; yet the logical inference drawn from an appeal to such a character, holds not the less for the sarcasm in which it is conveyed. My meaning is, that we may fairly conclude the reasoning to be such as *wise*

men

men would not disdain to consider; and so regularly conducted, as *wise men* would best comprehend. In a word, pursued with that science and precision which leaves no room for a loose, popular, and inaccurate interpretation. In the first place, therefore, we may collect, that the Cup of Blessing is not simply a general commemoration of a deceased benefactor, but a commemoration of Christ's Death and Passion: "It is the communion of the blood of Christ;" an expression, as will be seen hereafter, of the utmost elegance, to imply a feast upon the Sacrifice. But the inference the Apostle draws from it, puts his meaning beyond all doubt—"For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." He says the partaking of one bread, makes the receivers, of many, to become one body. A just inference, if this Rite be of the nature of a feast upon the sacrifice; for then, the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ unites the receivers into one body, by an equal distribution of one common benefit: But if it be only a general commemoration of a deceased

deceased benefactor, it leaves the receivers as it found them: not one body, but many separate professors of one common faith.

The Apostle having thus shewn the Last Supper to be of the nature of a feast upon the sacrifice; for the truth of which he appeals to their own conceptions of it—"the cup of blessing—is it not the communion? &c.; the bread, which we break, is it not the communion?"—; he then endeavours to convince them of the impiety of their behaviour, from the nature of these feasts, as they were understood both by Jews and Gentiles; who *equally* held that they who *eat of the sacrifices were partakers of the Altar.* But what had either of these eaters of the sacrifices to do with the partakers of the bread and wine in the Last Supper, if the Last Supper was not a feast of the same kind with their feasts? But especially, if the three feasts, Jewish, Pagan, and Christian, had not one common nature, how could the Apostle have inferred that this intercommunity was absolutely inconsistent? "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils,

devils, &c." For though there might be *impiety* in the promiscuous use of Pagan and Christian Rites; yet the *inconsistency* arises from their having a common nature; and so, consequently, (as they had opposite originals) from their destroying one another's effects, in the very celebration. The reasoning stands thus: Those who eat of the sacrifices were partakers of the Altar. A sacrifice at the altar was a *federal* Rite: consequently, the feast upon that sacrifice became a federal Rite likewise. The Lord's Table, and the Table of devils, therefore, being both federal Rites, the same man could not be partaker of both. This is the Apostle's argument to the *wise men* here appealed to: and we see it turns altogether on this postulatum, that the Last Supper is of the nature of a feast upon the sacrifice. Suppose it now a general commemoration only of a dead benefactor, and all this reasoning vanishes: for though a man cannot execute two federal Rites which destroy one another; yet a federal Rite, and a bare remembrance, in two contrary religions, have none of this opposition; but

may

may be celebrated, if not without *impiety*, yet without any of that *inconsistency* which the learned Apostle here charges upon his licentious Corinthians.

But this was not the only abuse they committed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper; nor this the only place in the Epistle declarative of the nature of that holy Rite. These Corinthians, as appears by the next chapter, had been guilty of celebrating the Lord's Supper in a very indecent manner, by confounding it with their ordinary repasts, or with convivial doings of their own invention, where charity and sobriety were too commonly violated. Now this indiscriminate celebration, the Apostle calls, the being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; a charge surely much aggravated, were the Lord's Supper instituted only to commemorate a dead benefactor. The Corinthians did not make a due distinction between their more ordinary food and the eating and drinking in memory of a deceased friend. This doubtless was a high ingratitude. Yet to rank these criminals with the murderers of the Lord of Life is a severity in which

which we can hardly see the justice. But let us only suppose, that St. Paul considered the Last Supper as a feast upon a sacrifice, that is, as a Rite in which the benefits of Christ's death and passion were conveyed, and at the same time slighted, and all becomes easy and natural. The profanation of such a Rite, by rendering his death ineffectual, was indeed aiding the purpose of his murderers; and therefore might be fitly compared, and justly equalled, to the prodigious enormity of that crime.

Such then, I presume, is the true nature of the Lord's Supper. And was the adjusting a precise idea of it, as it referred to a religious custom of antiquity, a matter only of curiosity and speculation, I might perhaps have left it to the ecclesiastical historian. But it appears to me to have important consequences with regard both to our faith and worship. For, if the Last Supper be of the nature of a feast after a sacrifice, then is it a declaration of Jesus himself, that his death upon the Cross was a real sacrifice. For figurative expression (as some are apt to deem

deem the Gospel representation of Christ's Sacrifice and atonement) could never produce a religious Rite of Divine appointment, arising from, and dependant on a real specific action. I say, of Divine appointment, because many of human original have been thus produced. Yet then only (which is a farther support to the preceding observation) when the figure had been mistaken for a substance.

If the Last Supper be of the nature of a feast after a sacrifice, then is it productive of great and special benefits to the partakers. For the partakers of the Jewish and Gentile feasts after a sacrifice did, or were supposed to communicate of the benefits of the sacrifice.

However, a very learned writer, whose principles of reasoning, and method in deducing and conducting them, may serve for a model to the fair inquirer, hath lately endeavoured to prove, in a "Plain account of the nature and end of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," "that it was "instituted merely in remembrance of "Christ; that the bread to be taken and

"eaten

" eaten was appointed to be the memo-
" rial of his body broken; and the wine to
" be drunk was ordained to be the memo-
" rial of his blood shed." His intention in this appears commendable. It was to free the last Supper from superstition; whose untimely fruit is at best, but a lifeless *rubrical* piety. Yet in pursuit of this commendable design, he has gone, I presume, too far: He has taken away its *specific* nature, and left it nothing but its *generic*. He has excluded the idea of a feast after the Sacrifice, in which the celestial benefits of the *giver* are conveyed; and has confined us to the notion of a *mere memorial*, in which the gratitude only of the *receiver* is returned *."

* As I must often mention a *diversity* of opinions on the nature and end of the Sacrament, I here insert a salutary CAUTION from BP. TAYLOR.

" Let no man be *less confident* in his holy Faith and Persuasion, concerning the *great blessings* and *glorious effects* which God designs to every faithful and obedient soul, in the communication of these Divine Mysteries, by reason of any DIFFERENCE OF JUDGMENT which prevails in the several schools of Christians, concerning the effects and consequent blessings of the Sacrament: For ALL men *speak honourable things of it*, EXCEPT WICKED PERSONS AND THE SCORNERS OF RELIGION."

SECTION IX.

Though the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be strictly a Feast on, or after, a Sacrafice; yet, in popular Language, and catachrestically, or by an allowed abuse of Terms,—*a common figure of speech,—it has been, and may still be, called, a* SACRIFICE.—JESUS CHRIST ONCE OFFERED ON THE CROSS *is the* ONLY CHRISTIAN SACRIFIC.

DIFFERENT names, we all know, may be given, without absurdity, to the same thing, according to its different properties and effects: and *use* and *custom* will authorize a name not strictly appropriate. Convenience, indeed, may require, that the *same* religious institution should be always called by the same name; but if it has various properties and effects, several names may be applied to it at different times and places, which, however diversified,

diversified, may all have some significancy and use, and cause no mistake. One name may have to encounter fewer *prejudices* than another; and for that reason, though, in a critical sense, less proper, it may yet be allowable. To call the Sacrament a Sacrifice is incorrect; yet it is so termed by many pious persons, whose language and ideas may not be accurate; though their meaning is perfectly right and their intentions pure.

But the truth is, that nothing is strictly and properly a *Sacrifice*, according to the practice and ideas of those who instituted Sacrifices, which is not brought to the altar, and consumed upon it, either in part or wholly; though in popular language, whatever is *solemnly offered* in the Eucharist, may be, as it has been, termed a Sacrifice.

Thus our excellent Communion service speaks of a *Sacrifice* of praise and thanksgiving—a Sacrifice of our souls and bodies, a *lively*, or, in modern diction, a *living*, sacrifice. Oblations of money are also offered, in our service, for the use of the *poor* indeed, but which we pray God,

in the first instance, to accept as an offering to Him and as tokens of our charity *.

The schoolmen, however, say, the Eucharist is both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice; it is a Sacrament, so far as any thing is *received*; and it is a Sacrifice, so far as any thing is *offered* †. They say also, that any thing done to the honour of God for the purpose of propitiating and appeasing him, may be properly called a Sacrifice. The ancient heathens did not confine this term to an oblation; but sometimes comprehended under it, the whole of their religious ceremonies, (their ιερουργια), whether they offered a victim or not. Plautus uses the term *sacrifice* more than once when he means WORSHIP only without an oblation.

Whatever was comprehended by the Jews under the word *corban*, a sacred gift, it is supposed, by some, to have been

* The Christian Sacrifice is properly Προσφορα, but improperly Θυσια, for Θυσια comes from Θυω, *macto*, to *slay*; but in our Christian Sacrifice we *slay* nothing, but commemorate only Him with an *Oblation* of Gratitude, who *was slain* and offered on the Cross, as upon an altar, once for all.

† Vide Thom. Aquin. Sum. Quæst. 65. Partis 3 tiæ.

considered

considered as a *sacrifice*; and this they divided into two kinds, the bloody and the unbloody, or the sacrifice of things animate or inanimate.

Any very solemn act of worship, says TURRETIN, in which something was consecrated to God for *his* glory, and for man's advantage, was called, in the style of the Old Testament, a *sacrifice*.

According to this latitude of signification, many pious and learned men have maintained, that the Eucharist itself is a *sacrifice*, and not merely a *feast on a sacrifice*; and when the term is thus *comprehensively* understood, there can be no sufficient reason for undertaking to refute them. From very early times, even from the Apostles, it has possessed this name with qualifying epithets, and has been denominated the spiritual sacrifice, the sacrifice of praise, the holy sacrifice, the mystical sacrifice, the unbloody sacrifice, and the reasonable, or intellectual, sacrifice.

The following passage from the prophet MALACHI was, in the primitive ages, understood to be predictive of the Eu-

charistical Sacrifice: "From the rising "of the sun to the going down of the "same my name shall be great among "the Gentiles: and in every place in-"cense" (interpreted prayers and praises) "shall be offered unto my name, and a "PURE OFFERING" (pure because unpolluted with the *blood* of real victims): for my name shall "be great among the heathen, "saith the Lord of Hosts *."

This was so very early applied to the Eucharist, that MEDE, whose opinions are always respectable, thinks the antients had learned thus to apply it by tradition from the Apostles. It was so applied in the second century by Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the former of whom flourished about thirty years after St. John, and the latter was a scholar of Polycarp, St. John's disciple.

By the *Christian Sacrifice* the learned MEDE thinks the antient Church understood not barely the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, but the *whole act of worship*, or solemn service of the

* Malachi, i. 11.

Church

Church assembled, of which this sacred mystery, the Sacrament, was (as he says in allusion to a ring) the pearl and the jewel. No public service of the Church was in those times without the celebration of the Lord's Supper. According to his definition, the Sacrament is "an "oblation of prayer and thanksgiving to "God the Father, through Jesus Christ." The sum of Mede's elaborate discussion seems to be, that the Eucharist, according to the antient Church, *is a sacrifice* of prayer and praise, *through* Jesus Christ, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine.

"The antient Church, says he, understood not, as many suppose, by the CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE, the mere Sacrament of the Body and Blood; but the whole SACRED ACTION (which *Sacrificium* properly means) or *the whole solemn service of the Church assembled; of which this sacred mystery was then a prime and principal part; no public Service of the Church being without it.* This observed and remembered, I define the Christian Sacrifice, *ex mente antiquæ Ecclesiæ*, in this manner:—

"An *Oblation* of *Thanksgiving* and *Prayer* to God the Father, through Jesus Christ and HIS Sacrifice; commemorated in the Creatures of Bread and Wine, with which God had FIRST (that is, in the Sacrifices of the *earliest* antiquity) been *acknowledged* as the LORD OF THE CREATURE."

To dispute about a variety of names where the same thing is signified, is frivolous; and frivolous disputes are censured by the Apostle. If men choose to denominate the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, a sacrifice, *in a large and comprehensive sense*, as an act of peculiar solemnity, there can be no valid objection to it; for there is at present little danger of encouraging the Popish doctrine of the *sacrifice of the mass*, the fear of which caused our Protestant divines, at one time, to take particular pains in preventing the name of *sacrifice from being ever applied to the Eucharist* *.

If the Sacrament be a sacrifice, it is a

* The word ALTAR, strictly and properly speaking, is not the right name for the Communion *Table*; an *altar* strictly and properly implying a *sacrifice*; but disputes about it, to the violation of Charity, are, certainly censurable; yet such there have been.

sacrifice

sacrifice (*sui generis*) of a peculiar nature. It is a spiritual and evangelical sacrifice. The oblation and the benefit are both of a transcendent kind; and the whole transaction, a mysterious intercourse between man and his merciful Maker; in which *the greatest good* may be conveyed to the former, in any *mode*, approved by Infinite Wisdom, however unaccountable to the reason of minute philosophers and the cavilling spirit of minute theologists.

But as much false doctrine and mischief has arisen from the representation of the Sacrament as a *sacrifice*, rather than a Feast on the one great sacrifice, once made for all men; I have thought it proper to discuss the subject in this place, and to repeat, that the Sacrament is not a *sacrifice* itself, but a representation of the one GREAT SACRIFICE. I will only add that the use of the words sacrifice, altar, oblation, in an *incorrect* and *inaccurate manner*, should be avoided as much as possible; because it may appear to countenance the error of those who pretend that they do properly and truly offer unto God, CHRIST HIMSELF, included in a wafer, the CORPUS CHRISTI contained in a Morsel

a Morsel of Bread, as a *real* and *propitiatory* sacrifice; than which it is not easy to conceive a more blasphemous absurdity*.

* On the use of the antient *Sacrifices*, as a standing representation of the ONE GREAT, GREAT, and UNIVERSAL SACRIFICE, the following passage from Dr. Holmes, the late Dean of Winchester, deserves our attention.

"Of Faith in the divine promise, the *external* expression, at PRESENT appointed, is similar to that which God accepted BEFORE. To the *communicant* bread and wine are the body and blood of the Redeemer, *after* his coming, in the same sense as *before* his coming, SACRIFICIAL BLOOD had been to the Offerer. In each of these *two* periods, the *visible* signs that *shewed his death*, had on that account a real SACRAMENTAL Virtue; at the *first*, and at the *last*, God authorized a *standing representation* of the UNIVERSAL SACRIFICE; only with that difference of Effect, which respectively suited the *fallen* and *restored* states of Nature, and the opening and accomplishment of his Scheme of Redemption. Faith in the Promise of a future Deliverer, and the accepted Sacrifice as a sacramental sign of the future Effusion of his Blood, were both of them to the PENITENT real Means of Justification; Faith in the Sacrifice, which that Redeemer has offered, and in the Promise of eternal Life which he has given, and the COMMUNION of his Body and Blood, which he has appointed as Sacramental Signs of his Death, are also NOW *real* means of PRESENT GRACE and FINAL GLORIFICATION."

I will take occasion to add in this place, that to teach that the Sacrament is a *Material* Sacrifice, is to degrade it to a *Legal Ceremony* instead of a *Gospel Service*.

SECT.

SECTION X.

That the present Benefits of the Eucharist are GRACE *and* PARDON, *is a Conclusion that must follow from admitting that the Sixth Chapter of St. John relates to it:— additional Reasons for thinking that the Expressions of this Chapter, already mentioned, mean much more than* DOCTRINE *and* PRECEPTS.

OURS is a far different task from that of our predecessors. We have not to combat with the errors of Popery: we have not to display the absurdity of transubstantiation, consubstantiation, impanation, and concomitancy; scholastic terms and ideas, which, under the direction of politicians, were called in to aid and support the errors of the prevailing theology. We have to contend with those who, so far from maintaining that there is any thing of corporeal presence and divinity in the Sacrament, seem inclined to

to insinuate that there is nothing at all in it.

And here it is impossible not to obvsere, as we proceed, the wonderful propensity of the human mind to extremes, strikingly exhibited in the present case. It is but a short time ago, when almost the whole Christian world professed to believe that the bread and wine of the Sacrament was converted into the real body and blood of our Saviour; and now Divines of high repute endeavour to teach the people, that the whole rite has *no significancy* but as a memorial, and that it is attended with *no peculiar benefits* to the receiver of the bread and wine, but such as may attend every other act of obedience.

Our Church, indeed, teaches that our souls receive strength and refreshment from a worthy participation of the Eucharist; great effects, and most devoutly to be sought for by all who feel the imbecility and wretchedness of unassisted human nature; and our Church is justified in this doctrine, by many passages in Scripture, but more particularly by those already mentioned, in the sixth chapter

chapter of St. John's Gospel. But the degraders of the Sacrament either omit these passages entirely in their consideration of the subject, or pretend to prove that they mean no more than the *doctrines* and *precepts* of the Christian Religion in general. Flesh and blood, according to them, are synonymous with theological tenets and moral maxims: and the *emblematical* Feast on the sacrifice of Christ, the victim offered for us, is no more than the receiving of his Gospel, and believing the history of his life and death narrated by the four Evangelists, together with the Epistles of the Apostles, who are said by some of the degraders, more adventurous than others, not always to reason conclusively, but to talk downright nonsense.

It is true, indeed, that the very remarkable expressions of the chapter in question have been the subject of much dispute among our forefathers; and it must not be concealed that many of them denied their sacramental construction*; but

* *Panem* de cœlo descendentem comedere non possunt; sed obstupescunt Dentes eorum, non ciborum austeritate, sed Vitio Dentium.—HIERONYMUS.

it

it is easy, on a candid retrospect of the controversies which agitated the Christian world, to see the principal reasons for the denial. The Roman Catholics denied, in some instances, their application to the Eucharist, because they feared lest it might render it necessary to give the cup as well as the bread to the laity. The Protestants, on the other hand, were apprehensive that the Roman Catholics might take advantage of the declaration "my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood "is drink indeed," to derive countenance to the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Both these causes of misapprehension operating but little at present, a careful and unprejudiced examiner will see reason to conclude without doubt, that the passages of this chapter refer to the Eucharist, afterwards more expressly instituted; and that our Saviour intended (by words intelligible enough after his ascension) to instruct his hearers in the BENEFITS of that mysterious rite.

The opponents contend, that the phrases, eating our Saviour's flesh and drinking his blood, mean no more than believing his *doctrine* or receiving his *instructions*.

"Bp.

" Bp. Hoadley in explaining our Saviour's discourse, in the sixth chapter of St. John, says, that eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, was *only* a high figurative representation to the Jews, of their duty and obligations to receive into their hearts and *digest* his *whole doctrine*." But is it to be conceived, that expressions so singular should be adopted for such a purpose? Unless some parallel expression can be found in antient authors, what can prove that the reception of a teacher's doctrine can be described, as *eating* the *flesh* and *drinking* the *blood* of the TEACHER? Does not common sense suggest that expressions so singular should be interpreted by similar expressions, if any occur in any other part of the Evangelical or Apostolical writings? And, as similar, or rather the same expressions actually do occur, in St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, which are universally allowed to mean the Sacrament, ought not these, of the sixth chapter of St. John, in fair construction, to be admitted to mean the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, thus announced in a *predictive* intimation of

of its nature and efficacy? The opinion that these words relate to the Eucharist, and mean a spiritual *manducation*, (as it is called), removes all the difficulty which arises from supposing our Saviour intended by such extraordinary words nothing more than the reception of his doctrines in divinity, and his precepts in morality. It renders the words perfectly proper, and peculiarly apposite.

I consider these passages as thrown out to *prepare* the minds of the Apostles for the institution of the Sacrament: and, under this notion, they appear in this place with singular propriety. An institution so extraordinary required that the minds of the Apostles, who, at that period, were not very docile in spiritual matters, should be *gradually* prepared for it.

St. John wrote his Gospel to supply the omissions of the others, and, according to that design he had no occasion to add the *history* of the institution, which the preceding Evangelists had already given, and which was already known; but it was highly proper to add these passages in his sixth chapter, because they tended

to

to elucidate the *design* of the Sacrament, and to point out its momentous consequences to those who might be inclined to consider it as a *bare memorial*, or as affording no present benefits to the communicant.

It is not reasonable to suppose the *same* expressions, and such *remarkable* ones, were used by the *same* speaker, or writer, in senses entirely *different*. Therefore, if our Saviour's words, "eating the body or "flesh," in St. Matthew, mean the Sacrament, it is unreasonable to interpret them differently in St. John.

This chapter, considered as referring to the Sacrament, fully proves the important benefits immediately arising from it; "*He that eateth my flesh and drinketh* "*my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.*"

How can God dwell in us but by communicating his Spirit to us? And how can we dwell in him, that is, in his *favour*, in a participation of his excellence and his happiness, but by receiving his GRACE, and the inspiration of his HOLY SPIRIT.

Most assuredly the *present* benefit arising from a worthy reception of the Sa-

crament, is the greatest that man can possibly receive, in his sublunary state; for it is the assistance of the Spirit of the Almighty; it is LIGHT and LIFE.

But the Holy Ghost will not inhabit a temple polluted with sin. It follows, therefore, that the *sin is removed*, and that remission takes place, as soon as the benefit of Divine assistance is received.

When sin is sincerely repented of and done away, who can doubt but that the Father of all Mercies vouchsafes a perfect remission of all *penalty* incurred? Therefore GRACE and PARDON are the great benefits annexed to the Eucharist; it being *always* understood, (and in an affair of so much moment it cannot *too often be repeated)*, that the communicants, in order to *partake* the benefits, must *receive*, in the full sense of the word, WORTHILY; that is, with *firm faith* and *sincere repentance*. And in answer to the question why it is necessary to receive the Sacrament, when Grace and Pardon might otherwise be vouchsafed to Faith and Repentance; let it be answered, that the reception of the Sacrament is *commanded*

manded by HIM who has a right to prescribe, without assigning any reasons, his own mode of conferring his *own undeserved* favour*.

* "Cum Sacramentis, ex DEI PACTO, conjuncta est VIS QUÆDAM DIVINI SPIRITUS, per quam agunt infallibilitèr in omnibus iis, quibus DEBITE administrantur, quique illa suscipiunt, cum eâ, quam Deus in iis prærequirit, Dispositione."

LE BLANC.

On the peculiar *Necessity* of obeying the COMMAND in this case, let us hear Dr. TOWERSON.

"Besides, that every neglect of a COMMAND, is *(as such)* a SIN against the *imposer* of it; and must consequently not only *despoil us of his favour*, but expose us also to his *wrath and vengeance*; besides, that such neglect must be yet MORE sinful and dangerous, which is a neglect of SUCH a COMMAND, as is enjoined for the SUBJECT'S PROFIT; HE, who COMMANDS this or that particular, for such or such an end, must thereby be *presumed* to declare, that he will *not* give it in *any* OTHER WAY than that which is PRESCRIBED by him; because *otherwise* a door would be open to the violation of his authority, which every wise Lawgiver must be supposed to provide against."—TOWERSON *on the Sacrament.*

SECTION XI.

The primary and most important Benefit annexed to the worthy Reception of the Eucharist, is a Vouchsafement of Grace in more Abundance than ordinary, *from which, of course, flow other Benefits, necessary to the Christian Life.*

THE great and prominent benefit derived from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is, GRACE *, or the benign Influence of

* Nimis Sacramentorum Virtutem *evacuant*, qui volunt ea tantum esse, vel Notas Christianorum, vel Symbola mutuæ Charitatis, vel Testimonia Animi erga Deum grati, vel allegoricas Commonefactiones; quibus, tanquam Picturis, ob Oculos nobis ponatur Christiana Mortificatio, Vivificatio et spiritualis Alimonia; vel qui ea duntaxat Instituta volunt ad excitandam Fidem per Modum Objecti repræsentivi; vel qui fatentur quidem esse Symbola Gratiæ; sed duntaxàt antè et extra Sacramenta collatæ; non autem GRATIÆ PRÆSENTIS; hoc est, quæ in *legitimo* Sacramenti Usu EXHIBEATUR et CONFERATUR.

GER. VOSSIUS, *de Sac. Vi et Effic.*

the

the Holy Spirit on the human heart. The remission of sins must, I have already said, of necessity attend it; for it cannot for a moment be supposed, that Grace, or the Influence of the Holy Spirit, would be imparted to a human being, still remaining under the displeasure of the Almighty. It would, it has been observed, be a contradiction in terms to affirm, that Grace is bestowed by the Deity on a wretched mortal whose sins continue unforgiven, and while unforgiven, must render him an object of abhorrence, and of punishment, instead of Divine Grace or favour.

The sacramental feeding on the body and blood of Christ is the reception of *spiritual nourishment*, emblematically represented by those *material* elements, which contribute most to *animal* nutrition and refreshment, BREAD and WINE. Growth in Grace is the consequence of such spiritual aliment. All Christian virtue is promoted by it, and thus ultimately salvation, or eternal life, becomes the effect of this holy rite. So that the *immediate* benefits of a worthy participation of the

Eucharist, are Grace and Pardon; and the *remote*, salvation, or a happy immortality.

It is very true, that all other religious and virtuous acts are conducive to these ends: but this act more immediately and effectually than others; not only because, when rightly and duly performed, it supposes and comprehends all religious and virtuous dispositions, but because it is the appointment of our Saviour; the positive, instituted, means, commanded by him, who knew what was in man, and what was best adapted to promote his advancement in all goodness and happiness.

The Eucharist seems to be a more important Sacrament than Baptism *, and much

* "Yet the Sacrament of Baptism is confessedly a means of conveying the Gift of the Holy Spirit; since, when we are *born of water*, we are also *born of the Spirit*; and the *washing of Regeneration* and *Renewing of the Holy Ghost*, are joined together. Why, then, should not Divine Grace accompany the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; since, as has been before shewn, the reason is the same in respect of both?

"God,

much more effectual than instruction by hearing, because they are merely *initiatory*, but the Eucharist is PERFECTIVE *; or, as it was anciently called, the *finishing* of the man in the school of Christianity. If any part of religious service is allowed to be effectual in procuring grace, pardon, and salvation, the Eucharist is much more; because it is the principal and the most solemn act of a Christian's devotion; and effects an union, or communion, with Christ himself, as well as with all that call upon his name. The Spirit of God is the grand agent in it, and the soul of man the object. Great is the mystery; and great, without doubt, must be the benefits under agency so extraordinary.

It is absurd to argue that the Sacra-

"God, the Giver of all Grace, may appoint what means he pleases of giving, and require what conditions he pleases also in us of receiving it. He can give it with or without any instruments or means; but if he has been pleased to appoint Water, Bread and Wine, as the instruments of conveyance, why should this be thought a thing incredible?"—BOWYER *on the Sacrament*.

* TEAEION.

ment is unnecessary, because God gives grace and pardon by other means, whenever it seems good to his wisdom and mercy. It were more reasonable to say, that if he bestows these blessings sometimes *without* them, we have more reason to expect that he will bestow these blessings *with* them, because these are means chosen and appointed by himself, for reasons unknown, indeed, to us, but sufficiently known, we may be sure, to his infinite wisdom. All we have to do is, to embrace the means appointed by him. Whenever the Angel moves the waters of the pool, it is ours to immerge ourselves, if we wish to obtain a cure, and not to stand arguing on the bank, and saying to ourselves or others, there are other modes of obtaining the like relief, better approved by our own fancy, our own judgment, or even our own supposed experience. We should rather say, here are *instituted* means of cure, which could not have been instituted without sufficient reason; and being instituted by superior wisdom, they are likely to produce a more effectual and

and more permanent relief, than any medicine which could be suggested by human ingenuity.

All modes of instruction, such as preaching and reading*; all modes of devotion, except the idolatrous, certainly tend to procure grace †; and that portion of grace, so procured, may, by the mercy of God, be sufficient for us; but these are all preparatory to the great opportunity afforded in the Eucharist, for changing our hearts entirely, for our participation of the divine nature, and for receiving an earnest, a pledge, an assurance (under the divine seal) of salvation, or a happy eternity. Faith, Hope, and Charity, are wonderfully improved by the Eucharist. Our FAITH is increased by

* VERBUM et SACRAMENTA in eo conveniunt, quod ambo *Gratiam Regenerationis* offerant et exhibeant; sed, quod nonnunquam Sacramentis *peculiariter* adscribi videtur, id inde est, quod Fides in Sacramentis hanc Gratiam videat clariùs, apprehendat fortiùs, teneat certiùs.—Voss. de Sacramentis, Page 251.

† ASCENSUS GRATIARUM, DESCENSUS GRATIÆ. CASSIODORUS.

the

the reception of the Sacrament. We must, indeed, have faith in order to receive worthily; but to him that hath shall be given, in this holy ordinance. The actual participation of grace is so pleasant*, that it gives the soul an appetite for more and more: the mind experiencing the faith of God's promises in the actual reception of his blessings, is so confirmed in goodness, as to be in little danger of relapsing ever after, into any great sins, much less, into doubt and infidelity.

Hope of everlasting felicity is encouraged in the Eucharist by a foretaste of Heavenly happiness, enjoyed, in some degree, while the communicant is under the influence of the Divine Spirit, shed upon his heart. He feels a *serene complacency*, above all earthly joys, in worthily performing this mysterious rite.

Charity is peculiarly promoted by the Communion We are taught in it to view Christ as our head, and ourselves, with all

* Delectatio victrix.

Christians,

Christians, as members of his mystical body. It is most truly a *feast of love;* and the heart that feeds upon it with the true relish of the repast, cannot retain a particle of envy, revenge, or malevolence.

All these (and more might be enumerated) appear to me, as, I believe, they do to the *majority* of Christians uncorrupted by the pride of modern Philosophy, to be the present benefits of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Nor let any one imagine the cause inadequate to the effect; Omnipotence can give efficacy to causes, which to man's limited understanding appear unconnected with the effect, as well as totally inadequate to its production. In the present case, it must ever be remembered, that the Holy Spirit, and not the created elements, is the cause; and that all that has been described, and much more, can doubtless be effected by that DIVINE PERSON with the most perfect ease. Nor let any one, who believes in the Gospel, doubt this efficacy of bread and wine, as EMBLEMS under the Divine direction;

tion; while he remembers that our Saviour cured *corporeal blindness* by the application of the first materials that occurred, even the moistened clay, however unequal to the purpose it may appear to men, whose narrow understandings are chained down to the confines of human art and science.

It is a satisfaction to me to produce the testimony of Bishop Warburton, on the *present benefits* of the Sacrament; and I rather choose his testimony, (as I have intimated before), because he was a declared enemy to every thing which savoured of irrational enthusiasm.

"Having now," says he, so largely inquired into the specific nature of this holy rite, we are enabled, in very few words, to shew (which we proposed as the principal end of the inquiry) what these BENEFITS are which we receive at the Lord's Table.

"Christ, by the sacrifice of himself upon the cross, purchased the redemption of mankind: and this rite being by its nature commemorative thereof, as it

is

is a FEAST UPON A SACRIFICE, each *partaker* receives, of consequence, the seal of PARDON, and consequently of restoration to his lost inheritance.

"But as this operates only on the terms of *repentance* and *newness of life*, the gift would be defeated, by being bestowed on a condition which our perverse nature so much opposes, was not this nature softened and subdued by the power of GRACE, that PROMISED BLESSING PECULIAR to the Gospel dispensation. Now, as the influence of the Holy Spirit constitutes the most INTIMATE COMMUNION of God with man, what TIME can we conceive so highly sanctified for the reception of it, as that in which we renew our *federal union* with our Lord and Master, in his last Supper, called by St. Paul, the *Communion of his body and blood?*"

It appears from this passage, that Bishop Warburton, who writes on the Eucharist in a masterly manner, was convinced of this most important doctrine; that Grace is vouchsafed in more abundance

abundance than ordinary, at the TIME in which we celebrate the Holy Communion*.

* Nemo dubitavit, in sacrâ Eucharistiâ fidelibus dari ΠΡΟΣΘΗΚΗΝ ΧΑΡΙΤΟΣ.

GROTII Epist.
ad Ger. Joan. Voss.

At THAT TIME, Η ΑΝΩΘΕΝ ΠΙΠΤΟΥΣΑ ΤΡΟΦΗ, as SUIDAS calls the MANNA, descends on the hearts ΤΩΝ ΠΙΣΤΩΝ in greater abundance, like gracious showers in the vernal season, causing the seeds of *religious* virtue to germinate in the good ground of a GOOD HEART. *Grace* is the MANNA of Christians; the Bread of Life; ΑΡΤΟΣ ΟΥΡΑΝΙΟΣ, ΑΡΤΟΣ ΑΝΗΡΟΤΟΣ, ΑΡΤΟΣ ΑΣΠΟΡΟΣ, ΑΡΤΟΣ ΑΧΕΙΡΟΓΕΩΓΗΤΟΣ, *bread obtained without the plough, bread without seed corn sowed in the earth, bread unindebted to the labour of the husbandman*, ΒΡΩΜΑ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ. 1 Corinth. x. 3.—Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ εστι ΤΟ ΜΑΝΝΑ, ως φυσει ζωη ων, και τα πανία ζωογονων, ος εστιν αρτος ο τρεφων ΨΥΧΗΝ και σωμα.

AMMONIUS.

SECT.

SECTION XII.

CHRIST'S *more intimate dwelling with us, or our Participation of his Divine Nature considered, as an Effect of, and Benefit annexed to, worthily receiving the Lord's Supper.*

THERE is no idea that occurs more frequently throughout the New Testament, than the mystical union of Christ with all true believers. Two allusions are chosen by the sacred writers to express the intimacy of this union, one from the vegetable world, the other from the animal. Christ is represented as a vine, and true believers, as the branches. What closer connection can be conceived than this; the branches of the tree deriving all their life and nourishment, and consequently growth, from the stem in which they vitally inhere? Christ is also represented as the head of a body, of which believers are the limbs or members.

Our

Our Church, in her excellent Communion office, asserts, that those who receive the Sacrament worthily, "dwell in Christ, and Christ in them; that they are one with Christ, and Christ with them." In what can this union consist? Certainly in some degree of resemblance at least, though it cannot be any approximation to him, in *power* or in *knowledge*. In what then does it consist? Doubtless in his Holy Spirit's influence, or emanation on us, producing Godlike qualities, GOODNESS of HEART, upright, honest intention, purity, and universal benevolence. How is it principally, and by Christ's appointment, to be effected? By worthy participation of the Sacrament. Man, through Divine mercy, is rendered, in the Eucharist, a partaker of the Divine nature. A food to the soul is supplied by the Sacrament, in consequence of which it is nourished, and arrives at that wonderful improvement in *goodness* and *purity*, which resembles in kind, though not in degree, the Divine; hence the Eucharist has been named, by great divines, THE SACRAMENT OF NUTRITION. What more intimate

timate union can exist, than that of the aliment with the body nourished by it?

As the daily waste of our bodies requires a supply of food, so likewise the decay of GRACE, and the decline of goodness in our dispositions, render frequent repair and support necessary. We are susceptible of diminution and augmentation in Grace, as long as life continues, and "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of "Man, and drink his blood, ye have no "life in you *:" the principle of life will be extinct without this food; and this food is afforded in the greatest plenty, at the feast of the Eucharist; a feast for ever to be repeated after the one great sacrifice.

Our Catechism expresses the true doctrine in terms which may perhaps be considered as too strong; since, from their strength, they are liable to misconstruction. It asserts, that the body and blood of Christ are *verily* and *indeed* taken in the Sacrament †. The compilers, however,

* John vi.

† "The Sacraments and Symbols, if they be considered in their own nature, are just such as they seem,

ever, could not mean, by "verily and indeed," to teach the doctrine of transubstantiation; for we know they abhorred it. If it be asked, what did they mean? I answer, that they meant, in opposition to the Romanists, that all, whatever our Saviour intended by eating his body, and drinking his blood, is *really* and *truly* taken in the Lord's Supper, notwithstanding

Water, and Bread, and Wine. They retain the names proper to their natures; but because they are made to be signs of a secret Mystery, and water is the Symbol of Purification of the Soul from Sin; and Bread and Wine of Christ's Body and Blood; therefore the Symbols and Sacraments receive the names of what themselves assign: *they* are the Body, and they are the Blood of Christ; that is, they are *Metonymically* such. But because yet further; they are Instruments of Grace in the hands of God; and by these his Holy Spirit CHANGES OUR HEARTS, and translates us into the Divine Nature; therefore, the whole work is attributed to them by a *Synecdoche*; that is, they do in their manner the work for what God ordained them, and they are placed there for our sakes, and speak God's language in our accents: and they appear on the outside. *We* receive the benefit of their ministry, and GOD receives the glory."—BP. TAYLOR.

In Sacramentis ea Conjunctio est Signi et signati, ut in legitimo *Signi* usu, ex Promissionis divinâ Virtute, simul donetur *signatum*.—Vossius, de Vi, & Efficaciâ.

there

there is no real and material flesh or blood either seen or tasted throughout the whole transaction. They meant to say, that though the bread continues bread still, and the wine is but wine, yet, whatever our Lord intended, is *verily* and *indeed* received by the faithful, without the necessity of transubstantiation; to all intents and purposes of affording spiritual nourishment to their souls; sustentation of the heavenly life, and union with the divine nature.

This spiritual nourishment is that which is called grace, the grace of sanctification. The real presence is not indeed in the sacramental elements, but it is in the worthy receiver; man becomes Christ's by this glorious privilege of divine union, through the Spirit's influence; and this constitutes the PRIME benefit of the Sacrament; which is undoubtedly the Holy Ghost's indwelling or assistance. "If any man is Christ's, he has the Spirit of God dwelling in him."

The passages proving this assimilation of the divine with the human nature, this prime benefit of the Eucharist, in the sixth chapter of St. John, are so full and strong

that it is impossible to resist their force. "I am the bread of life," says Christ, "he "that eateth me, even he shall live by me. "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my "blood hath eternal life,—dwelleth in me "and I in him.—Except ye eat the flesh "of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, "ye have no life in you." The meaning of which is plainly this; they that feed on Christ in the Sacrament have life, spiritual life in Christ; that is, they are connected with him, and supported by him, as the branch by the vine; and all that do not, have no life, but are like dead branches, or branches cut off from the vital stock of the vine, whence alone they can derive nutrition. The union of the branch and trunk is destroyed; the union of the human with the divine nature is no more; and man, in consequence, decays and perishes like the dead branch of a tree. But let it be remembered, that none but WORTHY receivers do really feed on Christ in the Sacrament, though they eat and drink the elements. According to an article of our Church: "The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally

carnally press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ."

Judas was *washed* by our Saviour after the declaration, "If I wash thee not thou "hast no part in me." Judas was washed with the other disciples, yet it cannot be supposed, that he had any part in Christ. A plain proof that something was to be done in the *mind* of the disciples whose feet our Saviour washed, either by themselves or the Holy Spirit of Christ, before the *bodily* act could be efficacious. This is necessary to observe, lest objectors should argue, as they have argued, the absurdity of supposing wicked men united to Christ by a single and outward act, the act of mere manducation. "It is "the Spirit *that quickeneth*," said our Saviour, "the FLESH PROFITETH NO-"THING,"

Some among the antients, whose opinions I forbear to cite, because they have been often cited, and my proposed limits do not allow room, seem to have maintained that the Spirit's operation was on

the elements, the creatures of bread and wine. In this, I doubt not, they were mistaken; the Spirit's operation is, I conceive, solely on the recipients; but what they say and held proves that they believed the Spirit powerfully active in the Eucharist; and they could mean nothing less, in asserting that the elements were sanctified, than that sanctification was communicated through the elements to the Communicants, which virtually and ultimately is the same doctrine which is here maintained.

None, who admit the doctrine of the Spirit's energy on the human heart, deny that the Spirit's assistance is afforded to man on many accounts, besides his worthy reception of the Eucharist*. But there is

* "It is no good argument to say that the graces of God are given out of the Sacrament; *ergo*, not by, or in, the Sacrament; but rather thus: If God's grace overflows sometimes and goes without his own Instruments, much more shall he give it, in the use of them. If God gives pardon without the Sacrament, then rather also with the Sacrament; for supposing the Sacraments in their design and institution to be nothing but signs and ceremonies, yet they cannot hinder the Work of God: and therefore *Holiness*

is every reason to believe that it is afforded more plentifully, with more comfort, and more certainty by an ordinance of Christ himself, purposely instituted to bestow it on faith and repentance than by any other means. Indeed the Sacrament is, as it were, a seal to confirm the gifts already received, as well as an instrument of present influences from on high, and an earnest of future salvation. It is impossible to suppose, but that every blessing must follow from man's union with Christ; that is from the influence of Christ's Holy Spirit.

That this is the case, is, I believe, the general opinion of pious, humble Christians, taught by the Gospel, and illuminated by grace, throughout all Christian countries. It is controverted by very

Holiness in the Reception of them, will do more then Holiness alone; for God does nothing in vain. The Sacraments do something in the hands of God; at least they are God's proper and accustomed Time of Grace. They are his *Seasons* and our *Opportunity*. When the Angel stirs the Pool, when the Spirit moves upon the Waters, then there is a healing Ministry."

BISHOP TAYLOR.

few, comparatively speaking, any where; and these few are men who have been misled into a false idea of the strength of human reason, and who endeavour by a proud and superficial philosophy, to explain away all that reason cannot comprehend, in the unsearchable ways of Divine Wisdom. The misfortune is, that, not contented with their own opinions in private, they are taking pains, by publishing them, to rob the pious and humble Christians * of all the comfort they used to receive, and still expect, from the Holy Communion. God's grace † must cer-

* The Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Dr. Hey, has this observation. "My own idea is this: when I say, that, in the Lord's Supper "the Body and Blood of Christ "which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the "faithful in the Lord's Supper;" I mean that though I may not know precisely what may be intended in Scripture by our eating Christ's Body and drinking his Blood, yet I believe that whatever is meant, a *worthy receiver* comes up to that meaning; he performs that action which is prescribed; he obtains that good which is annexed to it."

† "Grace is an *extraordinary* disposition and *Vigour of mind* to APPREHEND *religious* Truths."—TUCKER'S *Light of Nature.*

tainly

tainly prevail when the disposition of the recipient is good; but yet, as man's free agency is not destroyed, many may be misguided in their opinions by sophistical reasons, and deviate in their practice in consequence of an error in speculation *.

* To evil and worldly-minded men, immersed in sensuality, and entirely occupied by the pursuits of avarice, ambition, or *present* amusement, the *whole* of *this Doctrine*, the *whole* of *religious Wisdom* is FLAT and INSIPID; but "So," says BISHOP TAYLOR, "*are Mathematics to a Scythian Boor, and Music to a Camel:*"—And what says ST. PAUL?

ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ δε ανθρωπος ϗ δεχεται τα τϛ πνευματος τϛ Θεϛ ΜΩΡΙΑ ΓΑΡ ΑΥΤΩ ΕΣΙ. καιου δυναται γνωναι, οτι ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΩΣ ανακρινεται.

1 CORINTH. ii. 14.

SECT.

SECTION XIII.

Union with CHRIST *farther considered.*

GOD is a Spirit; the soul of man is a spirit, and the perfection of the soul of man, is its union with the Deity, the pure fountain of all that is GOOD and BEAUTIFUL.

The Gospel of Christ has shewn how this union is to be effected. A rite is established by the mysterious operation of which, man, duly qualified by faith and repentance, is to be one with Christ and Christ with him. The union may certainly be effected in any other way that God may in his wisdom choose; but he has actually, as appears by the Gospel of St. John in particular, chosen and appointed, the Eucharistical mode.

There is a natural union with God, and there is an evangelical. The Apostle probably means the natural union when he says, "He is not far from every one

"of

"of us; for in Him we live and move "and have our being *."

But of this union the animal and vegetable world partake with the rational. Man would derive no pre-eminence over the oak of the forest, or the beast of the field, from this union alone; for they as well as he, live and move and have their being in God, who gave and sustains all life.

God, therefore, has vouchsafed to his rational creatures an evangelical or spiritual union, an union accomplished not by nature, but by grace.

It were profane and blasphemous in man to pretend to such a privilege, if he were not justified in it by the written word of Revelation. We are there taught that, so far from presumption, it is our duty to aspire at it; and that, by the due use of the means prescribed, we shall not be disappointed.

Sacramental Communion is, without doubt, one of the most certain means of accomplishing this union with the Deity,

* Acts, xvii. 27, 28.

because

because it is the means instituted by our Saviour*. In compassion to our infirmities, he has condescended to take upon him the form of a man, so that his approach to us might diminish that awful distance between a worm crawling on the earth and the Divinity; an interval which might have discouraged us from entertaining a thought of partaking in the divine nature. Christ, assuming the nature of man, formed an INTERMEDIATE LINK in the vast chain which connects Heaven and earth. And Christ permits us in the Sacrament to be united to this link, by the mysterious operation of the Holy Spirit.

Our Saviour, during his assumption of the human nature, prayed thus for men: "That they all may be one, as thou Fa-"ther art in me, and I in thee, that they "may ALSO BE ONE IN US. That they "may be one, even as we are one, I in "them, and thou in me, that they may

* "God and Christ are more particularly present in the Sacrament *solely* by the *greater* CLEARNESS of our Optics to *discern them*, by means of GRACE."——TUCKER'S *Light of Nature*.

"be

" be made perfect in ONE *."—" For we " are members of his body †."

But far be it from us to affirm that this union is *essential*, like that of the Trinity; or *personal* like that of the divine and human nature in Jesus Christ. It is indeed an union, the nature and manner of which is too mysterious to be conceived by man in this mortal state. But it is declared to be real, whatever it is, and to be effected by Sacramental Communion. Thus much is enough for man to know. He believes the Holy Spirit's influence on his heart to be the bond of union with the Deity. He believes this great privilege is given him in the Eucharist, and he accepts it with pious gratitude. " It is the Lord's doing, and " is marvellous in our eyes;" but not at all the less credible because marvellous. Are not the greatest certainties around us marvellous? Is there any thing more marvellous than light streaming from the sun for ever with inconceivable velocity? The sun, absent at an immeasurable distance, yet ever present in its vivifying

* John, xvii. 21. † Rom. vii. 4.

effects:

effects; and bearing some analogy to what we may conceive of spiritual influence, continually flowing from the Fountain of Grace. "We dwell in him and "he in us, because he hath given us of his "Spirit *."

What then remains, but that wretched mortals, instead of disputing about things which are above their finite reason, thankfully avail themselves of the inestimable privilege, allowed them by their Redeemer, and spiritually eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, and thus become incorporated with him in the mystical union, by which, as St. John says, "We "dwell in Christ and Christ in us †."

From this union, effected by the Sacrament, *must* arise, unless the union should be dissolved by *subsequent* infidelity or guilt, the other great blessings of Christianity, remission of sins, and eternal felicity ‡.

For

* 1 John, iv. 13. † John, vi. 56.

‡ "By Means of this Sacrament our BODIES are made capable of the RESURRECTION to Life and eternal Glory. For when we are *externally* and *symbolically* in the *Sacrament*; and *internally*, by faith and the Spirit of God,

UNITED

For it cannot be, as I have already observed, that God should be in UNION with one who continues an *object* of his DISPLEASURE, and, at the very time of union, is doomed by him to perdition. The favour of God thus confirmed by sacramental union, and not forfeited by voluntary and presumptuous disobedience, must secure every blessing which Christianity was intended to bestow on human nature.

MORAL VIRTUE cannot but *distinguish* the Christian, while this union continues; for moral virtue is certainly necessary to the union. Impurity cannot coalesce with purity. "He that keepeth his com-"mands dwelleth in Christ and Christ in "him, and hereby we know that he "abideth in us, by the Spirit which he

UNITED to Christ, we are united to him who rose again; and when the *head* has risen, the members shall not see corruption for ever, but rise again after the Pattern of our Lord." BP. TAYLOR.

St. IGNATIUS calls the blessed Eucharist, αθανασιας φαρμακον, the Medicine of Immortality—and συμβολα της ημετερας αναστασεως, *the Symbols of our* RESURRECTION. BP. TAYLOR.

has

"has given us*."—"But he that hath "not the Spirit of Christ is none of his †." Now the Spirit of Christ is a Spirit of GOODNESS. The moralist and politician therefore need not fear but that Christians, who are truly what they profess, will be the BEST MEMBERS OF SOCIETY; for they cannot but follow every thing that is approved by the Great Governor of the universe; every thing conducive to the *real* happiness of a community. The sublime doctrine of divine union with man can never encourage licentiousness of manners; for licentiousness would destroy an union "with a Being who is of purer eyes than "to behold iniquity."

It is of infinite consequence that we seek union with God by every mode, and the Eucharist offers the most effectual. "If a man abide not in me," says our Lord, "he is cast forth as a branch, and "is withered, and men gather them and "cast them into the fire, and they are "burned ‡."—"He that hath not the Son "of God, hath not life§." Let us be-

* 1 John, iii. 2. 4.
† Romans, viii. 9.
‡ John, xv. 6.
§ 1 John, v. 12.

ware

ware of sophistical cavils. These words are very emphatic. They must mean something of the highest moment to a Christian; and the meaning is very fairly interpreted, as suggesting the necessity of seeking spiritual food, or union with Christ's glorified body, by a worthy participation of the Lord's Supper *.

* Let us hear the words of a most pious and eloquent writer of a neighbouring nation.

"Si je ne *communie* pas, je suis HOMICIDE DE MON AME, en le privant de ce qui SEUL peut la nourrir et la faire vivre." BOURDALOUE.

THEREFORE ΔΕΥΡΟ ΨΑΓΕ ΕΝ ΕΥΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ ΤΟΝ ΑΡΤΟΝ ΣΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ.

CYRILLUS *Jerosol.* Catechis.

SECTION XIV.

Remission of Sins more particularly considered as a present Benefit, annexed to the Eucharist.

I INFER that pardon of sins is the consequence, or rather the concomitant of grace, given in and by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; because we cannot be in a state of acceptance and non-acceptance with God, at the same time; because we cannot be objects of Divine favour, and recipients of Grace, while we remain under Divine displeasure, and exposed to Divine vengeance.

But I will here consider the remission of sins by itself as a particular benefit, bestowed on the worthy Communicant by the Spirit of God in, and by, the Eucharist.

There is an allowed and very evident *analogy* between the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Baptism

Baptism implied ablution of impurity; and even the baptism of St. John seems to have conveyed remission of sins. "John baptised in the Wilderness, and "preached the baptism of repentance "for the remission of sins *." There can be no doubt but that the baptism of Christ was in every respect more efficacious than the baptism of his harbinger. Christ himself declares, "Except a man "be born of water and of the Spirit, he "cannot enter into the kingdom of "God †;" and St. Peter said, "Repent "and be baptised every one of you, in "the name of Jesus Christ, for the re-"mission of sins, and ye shall receive the "gift of the Holy Ghost ‡."

The efficacy of the two Sacraments may be illustrated by their analogy. *Baptism* conferred pardon of sins committed *before* admission into the church of Christ; and the *Eucharist* confers pardon of sins committed *afterwards*; renewing our first engagements, made at our baptism, from time to time, during the whole of life.

* Mark, i. 4. † John, iii. 5. ‡ Acts, ii. 38.

It was mercifully ordered, that the decays of virtue, which, from the corruption of human nature, might happen after the first sacrament, should be repaired, as occasion required, by the second. Among the benefits of the second is the remission of sins committed after baptism; as among the benefits of the first is the remission of sins committed or entailed, before baptism. The Eucharist was designed in consideration of the misery and infirmity of man, as a continual *renewal* or confirmation of baptism. The obedience of no man, it may be presumed, is perfect after baptism; and therefore to no man does the Eucharist become unnecessary, from the circumstance of his having received remission of sins by his baptismal initiation.

It is indeed said, and truly said, that "None can forgive sins but God*." Neither does the doctrine that sins are remitted in and by the Sacraments contradict this assertion; for it is God who remits sins by the mysterious instrumen-

* Mark, ii. 7.

tality

tality* of these holy ordinances: and when the Absolution in the Communion Service is read, it is a pardon delivered to the repenting sinner from the King of Kings, by the hands of his servant who ministers at the altar, the commissioned messenger of a reprieve.

But I beg leave to observe, that this remission of sins has only a *retrospective* operation. The sinner may *relapse* after Communion; and, without repentance and repeated communion, the remission may be retracted, and he may finally fail of obtaining pardon. But I should think that to the DYING complete remission of sins is so far fixed and ascertained by the Eucharist, (since men, in that state, can scarcely be in danger of a *relapse*,) as to afford *them* just cause of consolation, arising from a firm and well-founded, but

* "The Sacrament is an instrument; not a physical, but a moral instrument of Grace, and APT to convey, rather than actually and infallibly conveying it; the actually conveying of that grace, depending on the mere disposition of the party receiving it; who, as St. Paul speaks, if he be not rightly qualified for it, will rather reap damnation by it, than either the divine graces, or the rewards of them."—TOWERSON.

humble hope and confidence. And surely it is inconsistent with benevolence to rob them of this last solace, by labouring (against fair inferences of Scripture, and the general opinion of great and good men in all ages of Christianity) to convince the unhappy sufferers, that there are no *present* benefits, no present grace, no present remission of sins conferred by WORTHILY partaking of the Lord's Supper. And be it ever remembered, and *without exception* understood, that an UNWORTHY partaking is no partaking AT ALL. It is an impious mockery, and must provoke rather than conciliate.

I will add something from the opinion of the Antients, men unspoiled by the *pride* of reason, concerning the remission of sins, as a present benefit of the Communion.

That the antient church considered remission of sins as a present benefit of the Eucharist, seems evident from the practice which prevailed of admitting those who had incurred its censure to the Lord's Supper after penance; by partaking of which, the criminals were entirely

tirely acquitted, not only in the sight of the church, but, as was supposed, of God; for they were immediately admitted to all the privileges of those who had never offended, and considered as cleansed, purified, and in a state of holiness and grace.

Some, indeed, of the ancient writers on the Sacrament, have not mentioned remission of sins as annexed to it; probably because it was a doctrine of such public notoriety as to render the particular mention of it superfluous, at the early period at which they wrote; when much of the Christian doctrine was certainly known by uniform and indisputable TRADITION.

The Clementine Liturgy, the most antient that remains, supposed to be more than fourteen hundred years old, and probably formed from earlier Liturgies, contains a prayer that those who partake of the Communion, may obtain, as the just and legitimate consequence of it, remission of their sins. Several succeeding Liturgies have similar petitions. And it is by no means to be concluded from those that have them not, that the doctrine of

eucharistical *remission* of sins was, at the time these Liturgies were used, unknown or rejected. The fairer conclusion is, that the doctrine was so *generally* admitted, that a specification of it was not deemed necessary in the common forms of prayer. It was implied, and followed of course, from a *worthy* reception.

The REFORMERS from Popery, appear to have entertained the opinion, that pardon is annexed to the Eucharist. Luther says, the drinking from the Sacramental Cup applies, seals, and confirms to believers the promise concerning the remission of sins; and Calvin, that it was Christ's design to hold out his body under the representation of bread to be eaten for the remission of sins.

That remission of sins is a present benefit to the worthy partaker, is taught by her own church, as is evident from the Liturgy and the Homilies. We pray in the Communion Service, "that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed by his most precious blood;" again, we pray, "that we and all thy whole church may obtain remission

sion of sins, beseeching thy Divine Majesty not to weigh our sins, but to pardon our offences;"—evidently meaning, in *consequence* of what we have just done in partaking of the holy Eucharist with faith and repentance.

In the Homilies we read, "There be but two Sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, whereunto is annexed the promise of free-forgiveness of sins." In the context it is implied, that remission of sins is essential to a true Sacramental institution.

Bishop Cleaver expresse himself thus on the subject, with his usual ability.

"It will be granted me, that from the very nature of a feast on a sacrifice, it was a pledge and earnest to the Communicant of all the benefits of the Sacrifice to which it belonged; whence I infer, that the feast on the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ doth hold out to the faith of a Christian ALL which THAT SACRIFICE, could we suppose it capable of repetition, would, from time to time, convey to the Communicant.

"To the question, therefore, in which the

the whole force of the objection to this notion of the Sacrament lies; does it as totally and perfectly acquit from guilt as the Sacrifices under the Law did? or rather more accurately stated with a view to the necessary conditions;—*Does the Lord's Supper, received with faith, convey a* TOTAL PARDON *of sins* DULY REPENTED OF? I answer, IT CLEARLY DOES; and that it does, from the very nature of the institution; not as an act of atonement or expiation, but as an application of the atonement made by Christ, comprise and convey ALL THE BENEFITS OF IT.

"These benefits in the present case, as they influence our happiness in this life, and are means conducive to our happiness in the next, I shall comprise under the leading articles of PARDON and SANCTIFICATION.

"The Lord's Supper, therefore, when DULY received, doth convey a FULL PARDON, and TOTALLY acquit from guilt, or the obligation to punishment, so long as the condition upon which its benefits are declared to rest, subsist in the mind of the Communicant; that is, it leaves the sinner

ner in a state of acceptance with God so long as he be careful not to forfeit this situation by subsequent instances of misconduct."

I have thus briefly reviewed the most MOMENTOUS doctrine of remission of sins, as a present benefit of the Sacrament, taking into consideration the analogy of Baptism with the Eucharist, and the opinions of the antients and of our Church upon it; but I return with satisfaction to the opinion I have already advanced, which is independent of human authority, and founded on the firm basis of reason and common sense as well as Scripture; namely, THAT REMISSION MUST ACCOMPANY GRACE. I venture to repeat, that, in theological language, sanctification implies justification, or in plain terms, that, as grace is confessedly given in greater plenitude in and by the Eucharist* than

* "The Sacraments obtain the Divine Aid in the same manner as *other* means of grace; though being the most sacred of our devotions, they do it in a *larger measure*, and may be said to bring down the Holy Spirit, as Prayer is said to bring down a supply of our wants from Heaven; not that it can move God; but because it

than by any other means, remission of sin *must* follow, because GRACE would be incompatible with the retention of guilt, and the consequent continuance of God's displeasure. The grace of God bestowed on a man, while an object of his wrath, involves a contradiction. The grace of God bestowed in peculiar plenitude, by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, implies *peculiar* favour and *perfect* reconciliation. And can *peculiar* favour and *perfect* reconciliation be compatible with an implacable determination to remember the transgressions of the offender, and to punish them in a future state? No subtilty of the schoolmen can reconcile a contradiction.

it moves ourselves *within the stream of his Blessings.* So they draw not the Heavenly power to shed his influence more copiously upon the heart, but draw the HEART FURTHER INTO THE CURRENT OF HIS INFLUENCE." TUCKER'S *Light of Nature.*

SECTION XV.

The ANTIENT LITURGIES, *still extant, prove that the primitive Christians, who were probably instructed by uninterrupted* TRADITION *from the Apostles, considered the Eucharist, with respect to the* BENEFITS *annexed to it, in the same Light as it is represented in this Treatise.*

IN acquiring a just idea of the primitive doctrines concerning the Eucharist, considerable regard should be paid to the prayers in the antient Communion Service, or Liturgies of the Greek, the Latin, and the Oriental Churches. Those prayers certainly contain the opinions of very early ages; which, it is not at all unreasonable to conclude, were handed down to them by tradition from the Apostles.

It is true, indeed, that these Liturgies are not thought to have been composed by the persons whose names they bear. They appear to me to be compilations from

from preceding prayers or Liturgies; and to have had a name given to them, not with so much attention to truth as to convenience and popular attraction. Selections and compilations have often passed under one name; thus we say, the Poems of Dodsley, the Grammar of Lily, the Fables of Æsop; though in each of those books there is little of the author to whom the whole is attributed. The antient Liturgies were not national, but merely adapted to the use of separate societies or churches, formed under some favourite bishop or spiritual pastor; who compiled such prayers as he approved from more antient collections, and then gave them a general name from some particular prayer, which tradition attributed to an Apostle or Saint of earlier times. The Apostles' Creed is not thought to have been composed by the twelve Apostles, in the form it now stands in; although the articles were probably delivered to the first converts, and although it contains a summary of the Apostles' doctrine.

We

We have still extant Liturgies under the names of St. James, St. Mark, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, of Nestorius, Severus, and others; all of early ages, but the most antient is the Clementine. This, however, is not thought prior to the fifth century; I mean in the order and form in which it now stands; for there is reason to believe that some of the prayers in it were handed down partly by memory and partly by writing, from the age of the Apostles, and perhaps from St. Clement.

Liturgies, or forms of prayer used at the Sacrament by congregations of Christians, ten, twelve, or fourteen hundred years ago, are not only great curiosities, but certainly convey the ideas which the early Christians entertained on points of doctrine.

In the Clementine Liturgy, about fourteen hundred years old, the bishop officiating at the Eucharist says: "Send down thy Holy Spirit, that all who shall partake of this bread, the body of thy Christ, and this cup, the blood of thy Christ, may be confirmed in godliness; may receive

REMIS-

REMISSION of their sins*, may be delivered from the devil and his wiles, may be FILLED with the HOLY GHOST, may be made worthy of thy Christ, and may obtain EVERLASTING LIFE."

In the Liturgy attributed to St. James, are these words: "Send down, O Lord, thy most Holy Spirit upon us, that all who are partakers of this bread and this cup may obtain REMISSION OF THEIR SINS, and ETERNAL LIFE, and be sanctified in soul and body."

In St. Mark's Liturgy it is thus written: "We pray and beseech thee, O thou gracious Lover of Mankind, send down from thy high and glorious habitation, the very Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, the Lord and giver of Life, who is every-where present. Send upon us and these loaves, and these cups, this thy Holy Spirit, that they may be to us, and to all that partake of them, for faith, for sobriety, for healing, for temperance, for sanctification, for

* να οι μεταλαβοντες αυτου ΑΦΕΣΕΩΣ ΑΜΑΡΤΗΜΑΤΩΝ τυχωσι. Apostol. Constit. lib. 8. c. 12. p. 407. Again, εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων. Lib. 8. c. 14. p. 410.

the

the renewing of soul and body and spirit, for communication of the blessing of eternal life and incorruption, for the glorifying of thy holy name, for the REMISSION OF SINS."

The Liturgy of St. Basil, as used in the Alexandrian Church: "We sinners, and thine unworthy servants, pray and beseech thee, O gracious Lord, the Lover of Mankind, that through thy good pleasure, thy Holy Spirit may come upon us and upon these thy gifts here set before thee, and make them the Holy of Holies; and cause this bread to become the body of our Lord God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, for the REMISSION OF SINS, and ETERNAL LIFE to those that partake of it; and this cup, the precious blood of the New Testament of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for remission of sins and eternal life to those that partake of it."

In another place of St. Basil: "O Sovereign Lord, Father of Mercies and God of all Comforts, bless, sanctify, keep, defend, conform, turn from every evil, and lead to every good work, those who have

bowed their heads to thee; and vouchsafe that without condemnation, they may partake of these immaculate and life-giving mysteries, for the REMISSION OF SINS and COMMUNICATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT."

The Liturgy of Nestorius: "O Lord, may the grace of thy Holy Spirit come and dwell and rest upon this oblation, that the participation of these holy mysteries may be to all that receive them for eternal life, for resurrection from the dead, and for expiation of bodies and souls, and for eternal salvation."

The Liturgy of Severus: "Send upon us thy Spirit, the Paraclete: may he descend upon us and upon these oblations set before thee, and sanctify them, that this bread may be made the life-giving body, the body of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and eternal life, to those that partake of it; and may he make the mixture that is in this cup, the blood of the New Testament, the life-giving blood of the Lord God and King of all, Jesus Christ, for the REMIS-

SION

SION OF SINS, and eternal life, to those that receive them."

The Ethiopic Liturgy: "Send thy Holy Spirit and Power upon this bread and this cup, and grant that they may be to all that receive them for sanctification and fullness of the Holy Ghost."

The Ethiopic Liturgy contains also the following Prayer: "O Lord, who sittest upon the Cherubim, and beholdest thy people and thine inheritance, bless thy servants and thy handmaids and their children, and give to every one who cometh to partake of thy wonderful table with a pure conscience, REMISSION OF SINS, together with the HOLY SPIRIT, for the salvation of soul and body, and the obtaining the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, through the grace and favour of thy only-begotten Son."

I will not add to the number of citations, as these are sufficient to shew the SENSE OF ANTIQUITY, respecting the benefits annexed to the Eucharist. All the antient Liturgies, by whomsoever composed, or compiled, concur in proving that PARDON AND SANCTIFICATION were the ad-

vantages expected from worthy communion. On this point there was a general consent of all Christian churches, however they might differ in matters less essential.

The opinion of Archbishop Wake on the authenticity of antient Liturgies is candid and probable: "As for the Liturgies," says he, "ascribed to some of the Apostles, as St. Peter, St. Mark, St. James, there is not, I suppose, any learned man at this day, who believes them to have been written by those holy men, and set forth in the manner that they are now published. They were indeed the *antient* Liturgies of the three, if not of the four, *Patriarchal* Churches; the Roman, (perhaps that of Antioch too,) the Alexandrian, and Jerusalem Churches, first founded, at least governed by St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James. However, since it can *hardly be doubted*, but that those holy Apostles and Evangelists did give some directions for the administration of the blessed Eucharist in those churches; it may *reasonably be presumed* that some of

of those orders are still remaining in those Liturgies, which have been brought down to us under their names; and that those prayers wherein they *all agree* (in sense, at least, if not in words, were first presented in the same, or like terms, by those Apostles and Evangelists; nor would it be difficult to make a farther proof of this conjecture from the writings of the antient Fathers, if it were needful in this place to insist upon it."

If we allow these Liturgies, in their present forms, not to be authentic; yet there is little doubt but that their writers, whoever they were, caused them to convey the ideas and doctrines which prevailed at the *time* of their composition; and this is sufficient for our purpose; which is to prove, that the *early Christians*, who may be supposed to have been within reach of tradition from the Apostles themselves, were universally of opinion, that the Eucharist, properly celebrated, conveyed, to worthy communicants, GRACE AND REMISSION.

I have already accounted for the appli-

cation of the term, *Sacrifice*, to the feast upon the sacrifice, which occurs in the Liturgies. It was a *catachresis*, or abuse of terms, adapting the name to *popular* conception; and, indeed, including the idea of a feast on a sacrifice, without which a sacrifice was incomplete *.

* I will here take occasion to remark, that a *reliance* on LITURGIES, (or *divine service*) on *attendance* at prayer, or the Sacrament, without proper dispositions, as an OPUS OPERATUM, and not as an OPUS OPERANTIS, is one of the absurdest and most mischievous of the PAPAL errors.

"Relying," says an old writer, "on the OPUS OPERATUM is as BAD DIVINITY as it is LATIN." So MANY *sermons heard* (he proceeds) SO MANY *prayers made*, SO MANY *alms given*, (all OPERA OPERATA) which many SCORE up to themselves, and RECKON upon; will *shrink in the tale*, when God takes account of them, and will prove *sermons not* heard, *prayers not* made, alms *not* given; BECAUSE NOT DONE AS HE REQUIRES.

THOMAS FULLER, 1640.

SECT.

SECTION XVI.

The Doctrine of Remission of Sins, in and by the Eucharist, not an Encouragement to Vice, but an Incitement to Virtue.

It has been apprehended, with some appearance of reason, that the doctrine of *repeated* remission of sins by a *repeated* participation of the Eucharist, may be favourable to perseverance in wickedness. It certainly would be so, if it taught men, that by merely remembering an historical event, or merely performing a formal rite, (an act of *implicit* obedience,) they could be cleared from all past guilt, however enormous, and delivered from all dread of punishment, however well deserved*.

But

"* It has been thought somewhat strange, by those who have imbibed wrong notions of the case, that all Christian Privileges should be supposed to follow a

But no such doctrine is maintained by any Christian society, nor by any individual,

single duty, when they really belong to the WHOLE SYSTEM of duties. But when it is considered, that these privileges are never annexed to this *single duty*, in any other view, or upon any other supposition, but as it virtually carries in it, or in the idea of worthy reception, ALL DUTY, the main difficulty will vanish; for, it may be still true, that those Christian privileges go along with the *whole system of duties*, and with nothing short of it. We never do annex all Christian privileges to this single duty, but as this duty is conceived, for the time being, to contain *all the rest* for *that* we take to be implied in receiving worthily. Let the same objection be argued in a very common case of oaths to a Government, or of subscription to articles, to which many State privileges and Church privileges are ordinarily annexed: What, may some say, shall all those privileges be given merely for the labour of repeating an oath, or writing a name? No, certainly: The outward work is the least and the lowest part of what the privileges are intended for, if it be any part at all, in a strict sense: The privileges are intended for persons so swearing, or so subscribing, upon a presumption that such oath carries in it all dutiful allegiance to the Sovereign, and that such subscription carries in it all conformity in faith and doctrine to the Church establishment. Of the like nature and use are our Sacramental ties and Covenants. They are supposed, when worthily performed, to carry in them all dutiful allegiance to God, and a firm attachment to Christ; a stipulation of a good conscience and

vidual, whose mind is in the least degree improved by reading, by hearing, and by due reflection.

The Sacrament is no Sacrament to those who receive it without repentance, and a firm purpose to lead a new life; a life of holiness which, together with piety, includes all moral virtue. No man, though he may eat the bread and drink the wine, can receive the Sacrament, properly speaking, while he has a

and, in a word, universal righteousness, both as to faith and manners: all which is solemnly entered into for the present, and stipulated for the future, by every sincere and devout communicant. Therefore in annexing *all* Gospel privileges to worthy receiving, we do not annex them to *one duty* only, but to all, *contained*, as it were, or *summed up* (by the supposition) in that *one*. All the mistake and misconception which some run into on this head, appears to be owing to their abstracting the outward work from the inward worthiness supposed to go along with it; and then calling that a SINGLE DUTY, which, at best, is but the shell of duty in itself, and which, in some circumstances (as when separate from a good heart) is no duty at all, but a grievous sin; a contempt offered to the Body and Blood of Christ, and highly provoking to Almighty God." DR. WATERLAND.

secret

secret intention to run into the same sins which he professes to relinquish with abhorrence, declaring, in the most solemn manner, in the Communion Service, "That he earnestly repents of his past offences, is heartily sorry for them; that the remembrance of them is grievous unto him, and the burden intolerable."

The disposition of the worthy receiver is so much improved by a due participation in the solemn rite, that it is impossible he should leave the Altar Table with a design to relapse into sin, under the encouragement of *repeated* remission. He cannot but consider such conduct as diabolical, and calculated to provoke most justly the wrath and indignation of that God whom he has just endeavoured to propitiate. An intention to repeat his sins, and a worthy reception of the Sacrament, are incompatible.

He may, indeed, fall into sin after communion, from the violence of temptation; from inadvertency, and from the frailty of human nature; but he cannot consistently with the hypothesis on which

I argue,

I argue, that he received worthily, he cannot, I say, sin purpósely and presumptuously, "that grace may abound," and with an intention to receive the Sacrament again and from time to time, in order to obtain an acquittal for past offences and to begin them again. If he should plunge into his former sins, or any new ones, tempted with the prospect of absolution, whenever he chooses to receive the Sacrament, his conduct is a proof that he was NOT A WORTHY RECEIVER, and that he had no just ideas of the solemn rite; and it is also certain that he will be disappointed in his wicked purpose. His former sins were *not* remitted to *him*, though they might have been to every other Communicant who, at the same time knelt with him at the Altar, and partook worthily. His sins were retained; and in his heart he must know it, for he must know his own hypocrisy and unworthiness. His own heart must condemn him.

Common sense decides the point, that no remission is granted to the unworthy receiver,

receiver, who is, in fact*, no receiver at all; and an unworthy receiver he must ever be, who comes to the Sacrament with a design to be pardoned what is past, that he may begin the same evil course with fresh alacrity.—"All men," says the judicious Hooker, "receive not the grace of God who receive the Sacrament of his grace. A blind man cannot receive light when surrounded with it." A wicked man, still living in and retaining his *known* sins, cannot receive the Sacrament; he may receive the Bread and Wine, but to him they are not consecrated, they are no more than the common food at his daily meal.

The truth is, that men wicked enough to entertain such a notion *never* come to the Sacrament at all, unless from hypocrisy. Such men do not, and cannot

* "Nam ANIMALIS HOMO, hoc est, qui sequitur cogitationes humanas et animales sive naturales, non est capax eorum, quæ sunt supra Naturam, et spiritualium; atque ita, et spiritualem Esum carnis Dominicæ non intelligit; cujus qui non sunt participes, non erunt participes æternæ vitæ."

THEOPHYLACT. in Cap. Joan. 6.

believe

believe in their hearts, that remission of sins is annexed to it. They deride the idea. They commonly think not of any thing so serious and sacred as the Sacrament, except with an intention to degrade and ridicule it. If they did think of it, and really believed that they could obtain remission of sins by it, I have no doubt but that, in time, they would be completely reformed, and their sins would be forgiven them. They would be favoured by the grace of God; after which it is impossible that they could ever consider the Sacrament as a rite which was to ease them of the old burden of their sins, in order that they might have strength and spirits to load themselves once more with a new one. They would loath their sins as the cause of their misery.

Repeated forgiveness upon repeated repentance, solemnly attested by an act, the most binding that can be devised, is perfectly consistent with the character of an all-merciful Deity, and not at all injurious to virtue, if the repentance be sincere; and if it be not, it is, in fact, no repentance,

repentance, and will not be indulged with pardon, but punished as hypocrisy.

Repeated forgiveness upon repeated repentance appears to me so far from favouring vice, as to be a powerful incitement to virtue.

Does not the prospect of forgiveness on repentance naturally stimulate the mind to make an effort for the RECOVERY of the peace of innocence, and the credit and comfort of virtue, by examining itself carefully, and using effectually the appointed means of grace? Would not wicked men be apt to go on in their wickedness, stifling their consciences, drowning all thought, and adding to their enormities, if they saw *no hope of pardon*, but thought they could not be in a *worse condition*, though, already deep as they are in the mire, they should plunge still deeper into the gulph of perdition.

Nothing, I think, can contribute more to making repentance sincere in the man who purposes to communicate, than a full persuasion that, if his repentance is not sincere, the Eucharist, instead of conveying remission of sins, will aggra-

vate

vate all that is past, add to it the horrid crime of being "guilty of the body and blood of Jesus Christ;" and by that means increase the danger and the severity of future condemnation.

After such solemn acts as those which a due participation of the Sacrament requires, a man of the least feeling and reflection, instead of growing careless, in consequence of the remission of his past sins, will be particularly attentive to his conduct, lest, on a relapse, he should not have grace to repent and lest he should be cut off by death, before he can again become a worthy receiver. He will be watchful of his conduct, and take care not to deviate from the paths of virtue, a return to which he found attended with difficulty, requiring very painful efforts, and much self-denying resolution. He must know in his conscience, that a formal participation of the Sacrament is, in fact, no participation; and that to be a true penitent, especially after presumptuous sins, requires a change of mind which no rite, hypocritically performed, can produce.

An

An absolution is indeed pronounced in the Sacramental Service, in the hearing of all Communicants, whether worthy or unworthy: but this and all other absolutions in the Liturgy are, in their nature, CONDITIONAL. If there be no sincerity of faith and repentance in those who are thus absolved, there is no efficacy in the absolution. Forgiveness is only given to repentance; which is supposed in pronouncing the absolution.

But a man of an honest and good heart, who has received the Sacrament worthily, rises, like one who has had a burden taken from his shoulders, pursues his journey in the path of religious virtue, with fresh cheerfulness and vigour, and, remembering how painful he found the weight of his sins, determines never to be encumbered with the like again; and the grace which he has received strengthens and refreshes his soul, so as to enable him, for the most part, to keep his resolution.

The privileges of the Sacrament are to be enjoyed only so long as they are not *forfeited* by subsequent transgression. "Circumcision verily profiteth," says the Apostle,

" if thou keep the law, but if thou be a " breaker of the law, thy circumcision " is made uncircumcision." The benefit of the sacrifice itself on the Cross was to be enjoyed only on the same condition. " Yet now hath he reconciled you, in the " body of his flesh through death, to " present you holy and unblameable in " his sight, IF YE CONTINUE in the faith, " and be not moved away from the hope " of the Gospel *."

" And, therefore, it is," says Bishop Cleaver, " that, in perfect consonance to the whole Gospel dispensation, our Church, in her Communion Service, hath taught us to pray that God for Christ's sake will forgive us *all that is past*, and that *we may ever hereafter serve and please him in newness of life;* without which amendment this pardon will be withdrawn, and leave the sinner in the state of his prior guilt, with the aggravation of having abused additional means of grace: and, therefore, with an increase of condemnation."

* 1 Coloss. v. 22, 23.

"Now, from this representation of the matter, which has nothing in it of subtlety; no consequence can be drawn to the encouragement of vice; whilst it affords a solid and substantial comfort to the penitent. On the contrary, the doctrine is as wholesome as it is obvious; it renders habits of virtue necessary to all, whilst it supplies a mighty incitement to the sinner, "by purging his conscience from dead works, to serve the living God;" and, by removing the weight of his present guilt, enables him cheerfully to "run the race that is set before him," and, with confidence, to aim at "the prize of his high calling."

"But in the present eagerness to *depreciate* the use and efficacy of this rite, it is probable we shall be still asked, of what need at all is a rite, the conditions of which, faith and repentance, are, in a general view, considered as of themselves effectual to procure salvation? Which question I shall answer by applying it to the other Sacraments; what need is there of baptism? yet the injunction is, "repent and be baptized." One step farther:

farther: What need of any *external* means? Yet the Divine Wisdom hath found them expedient in every religious dispensation. If the question could be asked by any sober inquirer, I should reply respecting both these Sacraments, that they are necessary *external* means:

"First, to be the instituted *expressions* before God of our faith and repentance.

"Secondly, to be each as an offering of ourselves, of our souls and bodies, *a pledge to him* of our future obedience.

"Thirdly, to be pledges *to us* of God's acceptance.

"Fourthly, as solemn professions of our agreement in Christ; without which there can be no Church Communion.

"Fifthly, to remind us constantly, that all our hopes of pardon and acceptance rest upon the sacrifice of Christ's death."

"And would it not be reasonable to expect, that the religious use of rites of such importance, by their practical influence, might be, by Divine appointment, the means of deriving upon us the blessings of pardon and sanctification,

in a degree *beyond that annexed to the performance of any positive or moral duty whatever;* even if we had not authority from Scripture for this conclusion *?"

* The holy Sacrament operates indeed, and consigns or seals our pardon, yet not ALONE; but in *conjunction* with all which Christ requires as *Conditions of Pardon*; but when the conditions are present, the Sacrament *ministers* pardon; as pardon is ministered in this world; that is, by parts, and in order to several purposes, and with POWER OF REVOCATION; by SUSPENDING the Divine Wrath; by procuring *more* Graces; by obtaining *time* for repentance, and POWERS and POSSIBILITIES of working out our salvation. For in the usual methods of God, pardon of sins is proportionable to our repentance, which, because IT is ALL that state of purity we have in this whole life, after our *first* sin; pardon of sins is ALL that Effect of Grace, which is consequent to that Repentance; and the worthy receiving of the Holy Communion is but one conjugation (or article) of holy actions and parts of repentance; but indeed it is the *best* and THE NOBLEST; and such, in which man does best COOPERATE towards PARDON; and in which the GRACE OF GOD does most illustriously consign or seal it." BP. TAYLOR.

"We must be infinitely careful to remember that even the *Death of Christ* brings NO PARDON to the IMPENITENT, *persevering* sinner; and the Sacrament of Christ's Death cannot do more than the *Death itself*; and therefore let no man come with his guilt about him and hope to find his pardon by this ministry." BP. TAYLOR.

Qui sceleratè vivunt in Ecclesiâ, et communicare non desinunt,

The following observations of Bishop *Kidder* on this subject deserve our attention, as they are plain and decisive.

"Let not the sinner who lives in sin and loves it, think to obtain his pardon by partaking of this Sacrament. This Sacrament will not avail such a man. For the *Death of Christ* will not avail him if he lives in his sins and loves them; and therefore this Sacrament can avail him nothing, it being but the annunciation of the Death of Christ: It cannot avail the sinner whom the Death of our Lord does not avail. It is a vain thing for such a sinner to take *Sanctuary here*. If there be not in our Souls a principle of new life, it is not the outward elements of Bread and Wine that will help us. God is ready to forgive us our sins; and we may see it clearly in this Sacrament, but while we *love* our sins, we are incapable of this Grace. It is the

desinunt, putantes se tali Communione mundari, discant nihil ad Emundationem proficere.

ISIDOR. HISPALENSIS, *de summo Bono.*

Nunquid carnes sanctæ auferent â te malitias tuas? —Jer. 11. 15.—The English Translation differs from the Latin.

burdened and the *laden* sinner that shall find this favour. It is he that hates his sin and strives against it. These are those whom Christ came to seek and to save. It is not the *outward work* that will save us, if there be not in us the GRACE OF GOD. There is no Pardon in the GOSPEL for the obdurate and impenitent sinner; and therefore we may not look for it in any of the *exterior* offices of Religion. He that comes to the Sacrament *in his sins* with hopes of a pardon for his former guilt, will contract a greater; and instead of preventing will but encrease and enhance his own condemnation,"

SECTION XVII.

The Clause in the Lord's Prayer, "*Give* "*us this Day our daily Bread,*" *has a Reference to the Eucharist; and the Clause,* "*Forgive us our Trespasses, as* "*we forgive them that trespass against* "*us,*" *a similar Reference; both together include the two great Benefits annexed to the Sacrament, to strengthen us in future* GRACE, AND THE REMISSION OF PAST SINS.

THE depreciators of the Eucharist have maintained, among other strange and conceited opinions, that the prayers, hymns, and thanksgivings contained in our communion Service have no real connection with the Sacrament; which, according to them, consists *merely* of eating the bread, and drinking the wine, in commemoration of our Lord's death and passion. But I hope to make it appear, that our Lord himself appointed a PRAYER which, though

it might be properly used on other occasions, was PARTICULARLY intended by him for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. If I can prove this point, I think I shall also prove, that our Saviour himself has evidently shewn the nature of the benefits which are annexed to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The Greek epithet* to *Bread* in the Lord's Prayer, translated "daily," is a word peculiar to the Evangelists; and *never* found, as Origen observes, either in Greek authors, or in colloquial language. The meaning of it is not yet fixed to the entire satisfaction of men who are best able to judge of points like these; but, whatever may be its meaning, it most undoubtedly does not signify "DAILY." How came we then to say, give us this day our *daily* bread? An old translator, not knowing how to render the word EPIOUSIOS, inserted at a *venture* the epithet DAILY; and subsequent translators, equally ignorant, continued to use the same word, under the sanction of the first mistake; our Bible

* ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ.

and

and Liturgy retained the error, for the same reason, and the prayer is to this day repeated by *millions* in a sense never intended by the Divine Author.

Some of the antients, and particularly JEROM, translated the epithet *Epiousios*, "supersubstantial *, and superessential," instead of "daily," and at this hour it stands so translated in the Vulgate Bible, for *ages* the *only* Bible of the PEOPLE.

JEROM, commenting on the eleventh verse of the sixth chapter of St. Matthew, in which is contained the petition for bread, says, "I have consulted the Hebrew, and wherever the Septuagint have used περιουσιος, I find סגלה, which Symmachus has rendered εξαιρετον, that is, *select*, or *singularly excellent*; therefore wherever we pray God to give us this *singular* and *excellent* bread, (he seems to think περιουσιος synonimous with επιουσιος), which we do when we pray for *Artos Epiousios*, (translated DAILY *bread*,) we pray for that Bread which he declares

* Qui super omnes substantias est et universas superat creaturas. MARTINII Lexicon.

himself

himself to be, when he says in St. John, "I AM THE LIVING BREAD, WHICH CAME "DOWN FROM HEAVEN."

Athanasius, in his Treatise on the Incarnation, informs us that the Holy Ghost elsewhere calls it the *Heavenly* Bread, saying, "Give us this day our *daily* Bread (*Epiousion*;) for he has taught us in this prayer to ask in the present life for the *Epiousion* Bread; that is, for the *future* Bread, the *Bread of Heaven*, the Bread which is to be our food in a future state, the *first-fruits* or *foretaste* of which we have in the present life, by sacramentally partaking of the flesh of our Lord.

Bishop Pearce, remarking on these passages, says, "The sense given to the word *Epiousios* by Athanasius and Jerom seems to be the more probable, because no other part of this prayer has any relation to a BODILY want; and this sense of the word comes most naturally after the other petitions." I beg the reader's attention to this circumstance, *that no other part of this prayer* has any relation to a BODILY want. This petition therefore comes in very *abruptly* and *unconnectedly*.

Ambrosius,

Ambrosius, in the fifth Book of his Treatise on Sacrifices, says, "The Bread spoken of in the Lord's Prayer is the *supersubstantial* Bread; not that bread which passes into the body, but the Bread of Eternal Life, which supports the existence of our souls, and is therefore called in the Greek, EPIOUSIOS. In another Treatise, (that on Faith *,) he says, it is called Epiousios, or *supersubstantial*, because it supplies an emanation of divine influence on our souls and bodies.

Damascenus says †, that the body of Christ, which is received in the Sacrament, enters (εἰς τὴν ΟΥΣΙΑΝ,) into the very nature and essence of our souls. It is therefore called *Epiousios*.

Cyril of Alexandria asserts, "that by (*Artos Epiousios*) translated "daily bread," is to be understood CHRIST, the Spiritual Bread; because we are commanded by Christ himself to *pray* for nothing *carnal*, but for every thing divine and SPIRITUAL.

Germanus says, as quoted by Suicerus,

* Ambros. de Fide, lib. 37.

† In Epistola ad Zachariam Episcopum.

"The

"The Bread, called in the Lord's Prayer *Epiousios*, is CHRIST, (Ο ΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟ ΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΝΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΑΙΩΝΑΣ,) *who is existence itself; who existed before the world*, and *will exist for ever*." Theophylact says, "(ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΑΡΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ). The BODY of Christ is the *Artos Epiousios*, the daily Bread in the Lord's Prayer *." A strong confirmation of the opinion, that it has a reference to the Sacramental Bread.

Cyprian says, "We call it *our* bread in this prayer, becaue Christ, as we Christians appertain to his body, is *our* Bread. We pray that this Bread may be given us *every day*, that we who are in Christ, and receive the *Eucharist every day*, as the food necessary to our health, may not be compelled by sin to abstain from communicating, and thus be separated from the body of Christ;" and again, "We pray that *our* Bread may be daily given us; that is, that Christ may be daily given us." St. Cyprian also says, "There are

* Και το σωμα δε του ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΟΥ αρίος εστι ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ ου μεταλαμβανειν ευχομεθα.—Theophphyl. in Matt. 6.

several

several great *Sacraments* (mysteries) in the Lord's Prayer;" evidently intimating, that it was not to be understood in its LITERAL sense, but had a SUBLIME signification in those parts which appear to be most familiar.

Tertullian observes, that, "Though we pray, saying, "Give us this day our daily bread," yet this ought to be spiritually understood; because Christ is *our* Bread. By asking daily bread, we ask for continuance in Christ, and *never* (no not for a day) to be separated from his mystical body."

Augustine, in his Letters to Proba, observes nearly the same things: and they *all* found their opinion on our Saviour's denominating himself BREAD, in the sixth chapter of St. John; so that if bread in that chapter has a reference to the Eucharist, which I hope has been proved, then *bread* in this prayer, I should think, must undoubtedly have the same reference.

Many of the antients seem to think with Cyprian, that in repeating the fourth clause in the Lord's Prayer, (the petition for daily Bread,) an emphasis should be laid on the word OUR. It signified, as they

they intimate, our *particular* bread; *ours* as *Christians*, in distinction from common bread; *our* bread, "ours," as belonging to the mystical body of Christ; ours as fed by an emanation of his Spirit from Heaven, as the Children of Israel were nourished by MANNA.

I shall now beg leave to translate this part of the petition thus: *Give us this day the Bread of Life*; or, Give us this day the *Bread* necessary to our *spiritual* existence. I need not explain to the learned my reasons for interpreting (επιουσιον) the epithet applied to Bread in the Greek, the Bread of Life, or the Bread necessary to spiritual existence; for I believe every candid *scholar* will allow, from the *etymology* of the word, that it admits of that interpretation, more easily and properly than of any other.

But why do I add the epithet to the word Existence, SPIRITUAL? This certainly remains to be accounted for. I have no objection to transferring the epithet to the word BREAD, and then the passage will run: Give us this day our SPIRITUAL BREAD; but, in its present situation,

situation, it conveys the meaning completely. I have only to justify, if I can, such a construction.

Our Saviour frequently uses the word *Bread* in a figurative sense, for spiritual sustenance. "I AM THE BREAD OF LIFE. "The Bread that I will give is my flesh; "except ye eat of this flesh, ye have no "life in you;" that is, no OUSIA, no *spiritual* existence. Therefore this bread is necessary *(epi ousian)* to your *spiritual* existence, the *life* of your *immaterial* part.

In general, therefore, it may be observed, that the bread prayed for in the Lord's Prayer is the bread which Christ speaks of, when he says, "I *am the* Bread "of Life;" and signifies that *divine influence* on the soul of man, that aliment from Heaven which FEEDS and sustains the Christian life.

In *particular*, the Bread prayed for in the Lord's Prayer refers to that bread which was afterwards to be eaten, till our Lord's second coming, by the faithful at the EUCHARISTICAL FEAST, or Feast on the Sacrifice of Christ; that Bread which was to constitute the FOOD or NOURISHMENT of the

the soul in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; namely, the HOLY SPIRIT'S INFLUENCE, or divine GRACE.

Our Saviour, I have no doubt, appointed this prayer with a *particular* view to the celebration of the *Eucharist*, which he soon after instituted; and Christians, guided by tradition from the Apostles, in the earliest times of Christianity, applied the Lord's Prayer, almost *exclusively*; to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which was then received *every day*; and which constituted the principal part, if not the whole, of the Divine Service, among the primitive Christians. They met for *no other* purpose.

The Lord's Prayer was, at that time called the *Prayer of the Faithful* (ΕΥΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΠΙΣΤΩΝ,) and by the epithet *faithful* was understood those who had received baptism, in contradistinction to the *catechumens*, who were only in a state of instruction preparatory to Baptism. After the *common* prayers, and just before the administration of the Elements, the Deacon proclaimed aloud in the church, "Depart hence, all those who are only catechumens,

chumens, or in a state of preparatory instruction; but all who come under the title of (ΟΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΙ) the FAITHFUL, are to remain; and let us pray to the Lord in peace." Those *alone* that were thus admitted to the Eucharist were *allowed* to say the LORD'S PRAYER, because they *only* could with propriety pray, in the fourth clause, for (*Artos Epiousios*) the Bread of Life*. The prayer was denominated from this circumstance the PRAYER OF THE FAITHFUL, or of confirmed Christians. It was *confined* to their use, and was daily repeated *immediately* after the consecration of the elements, by all who were assembled to COMMUNICATE, and by none else.

It is wonderful that the word *bread*, in the Lord's Prayer, has been so generally

* Non poterant Dominicam Orationem recitare (catechumeni) quia verba petitionis quartæ τον αρτον ημων επιουσιον δος ημιν σημερον ab OMNIBUS POENE DE EUCHARISTIA explicabantur; cujus mysterii, cum nondum potuerint esse participes, ΑΜΥΕΤΟΙ frustra hanc petitionem recitassent.

Vide Albaspinæi, lib. i. obs. 19.
et Suiceri Lex. in voc. *Euche.*

understood to signify *common* food *. It would be quite as reasonable to understand the next, or *fifth* clause of DEBTS *literally*, as meaning debts of *money (æs alienum)*, as the fourth clause, of bread, *(victus,)* food or victuals. But all seem to have agreed in rendering οφειλημαΐα (*debts*, in the Greek,) TRESPASSES and sins; that *debts* to God and not to man. St. Luke indeed *explains* St. Matthew's *debts* by αμαρτίας, sins; but he retains the original idea of debts by retaining in the next part of the sentence (οφειλοντι) "as we forgive our debtor;" and even the word αμαρτίας, sins, is οφειλημαΐα, *debts*, in the Cambridge manuscript, according to the very learned Dr. MILL.

Perhaps nobody will object to the opinion that BREAD in the Gospel stands for

* Ου γαρ ως κοινον αρτον λαμβανομεν.—Justin Martyr Apol. ii. 1. Cor. xi. 21.

Oratio illa *nihil* TERRENUM *habet*, sed *omnia cælestia*, et ad animum tendentia.

This prayer has nothing in it that has any reference to earthly matters; but is wholly of celestial tendency, and appertains to the wants of the MIND.

Isidor. Pelusiot. Epist.

the

the Word of God, the Grace of God, and the doctrines and precepts of our Saviour. But many will be ready to say, that as the Sacrament was not instituted when the Lord's Prayer was prescribed, nothing contained in it *can* have a reference to a *subsequent* institution.

That this common objection is destitute of force, may be proved by what has *already* been said in applying the passages of the sixth chapter of St. John to the Eucharist, which was not instituted till a year or two after they were uttered. Our Lord, whose prophetic mind looked forward into futurity with more ease than we can recall the scenes and events that are past, could have no difficulty in adapting the words of the prayer to the *future purposes* of a most important, though not yet established solemnity: a rite, which was to perpetuate the memory of his death and passion, and to be the means of conveying their benefits, in all ages, to his faithful and penitent followers. It may be said that his disciples could not understand the words completely *precious* to the institution: but his disciples,

ciples, it is acknowledged, *frequently* did *not* understand him, neither did he intend that they *always* should, till after his ascension. His disciples had not the gift of prophecy, nor could they understand him, where he says, "The Son "of Man shall be delivered unto the "Gentiles, and they shall scourge him, "and put him to death, and the third "day he shall rise again. They under- "stood none of these things, and this "saying was hid from them; neither "knew they the things which were "spoken."

But will any be absurd enough to say that Christ could not, in these words, allude to his resurrection, because they were spoken *before* his resurrection?

Again he says: "What and if ye shall "see the Son of Man ascend up whither "he was before?" Will any man say he could not refer to his ascension, because he had not yet ascended?

Is it then absurd to suppose, in several passages, where he mentions the *bread* which was to give life, SPIRITUAL LIFE, that he intimates to his disciples the Eucharistical

charistical institution, which was not then instituted; but which he intended afterwards to ordain?

To understanding the *bread* mentioned in the Lord's Prayer, as referring to the Sacrament, there can be no objection from the circumstance of the institution of the Sacrament having been *posterior* to the prescription of the prayer, Our Saviour, it appears, alluded to several other things, in the same way, before they happened, and before they were, or could be, understood by his disciples; who were the more struck with them, when, in due time, they were fully disclosed by the event. The Prophecy confirmed their faith.

"These things *understood* not his disciples at first; but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him*."

The other petitions of this prayer are of a *spiritual* and sublime nature. The *harmony* of the whole, if I may so express it, requires that this petition for BREAD

* John, xii. 16.

also should be *spiritual* and sublime. It is a very sudden transition from praying that God's "kingdom may come, and "his will be done on earth as it is in hea-"ven," immediately to supplicate for *daily bread*, for the *meat that perisheth*; especially as our Saviour says, "Labour "not for the meat that perisheth, but "for that which endureth unto everlasting "life. Take no thought for your life, "what ye shall eat and what ye shall "drink; the life is more than meat. "Therefore, take no thought, saying, what "shall we eat, for your Heavenly Father "knoweth that ye have need of these "things; but seek ye first the kingdom "of God, and his righteousness, and all "these things shall be added to you *." Did he who said this teach us to *pray* for daily bread, the food that perisheth?

In conformity to both Scripture and reason, I therefore would *alter* the translation of the fourth petition in the Lords Prayer, and read, instead of "Give us "this day our daily bread;"—"Give us

* Matt. vi. 33; Luke, xii. 31.

this

this day the BREAD OF LIFE, the Bread necessary to our *spiritual existence*; that is, vouchsafe unto us nourishment to our souls, the influence of the Holy Spirit; without which, though our animal part may vegetate, we are assured by thy Son our Saviour, there *is no life in us;* none of *that* life which, assimilates us to the *divine*, and which, through thy mercy, will conduct us to life eternal. Therefore we beseech thee to feed us with such spiritual food this day, and every day; but more particularly when we come to thy Table, and take the *material* bread in remembrance that Christ died for us, and feed on it in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving."

It appears to me, that this mode of interpretation adds greatly to the *sublimity* and *significancy* of the Lord's Prayer; and at the same time gives us reason to expect the Bread of Life in the instituted rite of the Eucharist; which has been called by divines of the first character, as I have before observed, the SACRAMENT OF NUTRITION. The clause means then, in its true sense, as follows, "Leave us not des-

titute of the *Bread that comes down from Heaven*, without which whosoever liveth is dead before thee." This clause then refers to the benefit of GRACE.

With respect to the *next clause* in this most interesting prayer: "*And* forgive us "our trespasses, as we forgive them that "trespass against us," I know not that divines have considered it as particularly and intentionally referring to the other great benefit annexed to the Holy Communion, the REMISSION OF SINS; but as it appears, from what has been already advanced in this Section, that the *fourth* clause, and indeed the whole of the prayer was, with great appearance of reason, *appropriated* by the first Christians to the *Sacrament*; I have no hesitation in saying, that this fifth clause also may have a particular and intentional reference to the *remission of sins*, annexed to the worthy reception of the Eucharistical elements. It is placed next in order to the petition for the *Bread of Life*, or Grace; and the *juxta-position* and connection by a *copulative conjunction*, induce me to think that our Saviour meant to combine,

in

in these *two clauses*, the two great benefits of the Sacrament, GRACE and PARDON. This interpretation of both clauses appears to me to display a *connection*, a HARMONY, a BEAUTY, and an IMPORTANCE in the prayer, adequate to the dignity of its divine Author.

But the limitation of the meaning to *Bread* in the *literal* sense, a meaning not authorized by the Greek word *Epiousios;* a meaning, which does not *harmonize* with the sublimity and spirituality of the other petitions, seems to me unauthorized by *reason*, unsupported by the original, and derogatory from the exalted purpose of the prayer, which, in my opinion, is ALL *Spiritual*, and comprehends not the wants of *animal* nature*.

* Precandi Forma ab ipso Christo præscripta, mirâ Verborum paucitate, sex septemve concisa membris, MAGNA MYSTERIA complectitur.

STUCKII Antiq. Conviv.

SECT.

SECTION XVIII.

Farther Considerations on understanding the Petition for Bread, in the Lord's Prayer, to mean the Bread of Life, spoken of in St. John's Sixth Chapter,—that is, the Bread of the Eucharist, or the Divine Influence.

In their journey through the Wilderness, the Jews had been fed from Heaven with MANNA: it was perfectly natural, therefore, that a people, on whom so miraculous a supply must have made a deep and indelible impression, should give the name of Bread from Heaven to all influence and assistance which they believed divine. It is no wonder that our Saviour, addressing a people whose minds were so strongly impressed with the idea of heavenly food, should call the celestial favours, which he had to bestow on them, by

by the name of Bread; a figure, strong indeed, but a figure which, from its familiarity to their minds, almost ceased to be figurative. No wonder he taught them to pray for spiritual or heavenly succours, under the name of *Bread*, that *manna* which their forefathers received from Heaven, at once nourishing their bodies and confirming their faith. He condescended to assume the very name himself, (alluding to the sustenance which came down from Heaven) and to say, "*I am the Bread of Life.*" To the minds of the JEWS there could be nothing HARSH in this metaphor: it was their perverseness only which led them to understand the term in the gross and literal sense. They could not, without peculiar tardiness or perverseness, misunderstand the word Bread in the prayer of our Lord; because it was accompanied with an epithet (rendered from the Hebrew *Epiousios*) which at once shewed that it was to be considered as the food necessary to spiritual existence; since *ousia*, whence the epithet is derived, is not the proper word for

for the life of the body, but the life of the soul; pure being, or EXISTENCE.

And this leads me to a farther consideration of the epithet *Epiousios*, which I translate, "necessary for spiritual essence or existence." The word OUSIA, from which it derives its meaning, signifies, BEING, ESSENCE; not temporary life, like that of the body, but pure indissoluble essence; the essence of the soul, and of the Deity, who was accordingly called by the word, from which *ousia* is immediately derived, O ΩN—I AM; that is, pure essence, not subject to mortality, but existing from everlasting to everlasting independantly of HYLE or MATTER.

The ARTOS EPIOUSIOS, in the Lord's Prayer, is a participation of this Bread of Life, this Divine Essence. According to Anastasius and Cyrillus, ΟΥΣΙΑ *εστι πραγμα αυθυπαρκτον, μη δεομενον ετερου προς την εαυτου συστασιν.* OUSIA, *Essence, is that which exists from itself, unindebted to any other for its subsistence.* IT is TO ON, PURE BEING.

But supposing for a moment, which I cannot

cannot however believe, that *Epiousios* is derived from εϖιων, it will then signify *future*, that Bread which we are hereafter to have in Heaven. There seems to be an antithesis between σημερον and εϖιουσιον, which is the only thing in my mind that favours this interpretation. It may *then* be translated thus: "Give us *this day* a foretaste of that Bread which is reserved for us in a future." Allowing this to be the true translation, as some learned men have thought, the sense will still be equally favourable to my interpretation of spiritual Bread, or divine Grace: "Give us now on earth that spiritual Bread which in Heaven is to be the food of our souls hereafter." It cannot be understood of *to-morrow's* bread, as some have interpreted it;—for it seems absurd to say, give us this day the bread of to-morrow. And, besides, our Saviour has expressly said, "Take no thought for the *morrow*, nei-
"ther what ye shall EAT, nor what ye
"shall drink; for your Heavenly Father
"knoweth ye have need of all these
"things;" and (as must be intended)

will

will mercifully supply them without your PRAYER or solicitude.

If *Epiousios* were properly translated *daily*, in St. Luke, where the prayer is differently worded, the petition would run thus: "Give us daily our daily bread," which would be a tautology; but "Give us from day to day that heavenly bread, which is necessary to sustain the spiritual life bestowed as the peculiar privilege of Christ's religion," is a petition which elevates the mind with sublime devotion; and of a piece with the whole form of supplication.

This spiritual food, there is no doubt, *is* given to them who ask it with faith and true penitence, EVERY DAY. "If ye," says our Saviour, "being evil, know how "to give good gifts unto your children, "how much more shall your Heavenly Fa- "ther give the Holy Spirit to them that "ask him." And he himself has taught us to *ask* our Father, our *Heavenly* Father, for the Holy Spirit in the form prescribed, under the figurative appellation of Bread. But it is to be believed that larger portions

tions of grace are bestowed by a rite of his own institution, when worthily performed, than by prayer alone.

Christ has instituted and ordained a holy mystery as a pledge of his love; in which, while we worthily receive the created food and refreshment, bread and wine, according to his institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, we become partakers of his most blessed body and blood, that is, his Divine nature, emanating into our very souls, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and feeding them from time to time, as they may require new strength and refreshment. We there receive the *artos Epiousios*, the Bread of Life.

The Oriental people, it is well known, expressed their religious ideas by strong figures originally borrowed, perhaps, from HIEROGLYPHICS. The words bread, body, flesh, and blood, used for spiritual sustenance, or improvement of the soul in divine virtue, did not sound uncouth to them, because they were used to similar modes of expression, not only in their sacrifices, but in the general style of Oriental poetry. Happy they who are not offended

offended with these or any other difficulties, which previous to due examination, may appear to attend the divine doctrines of our Redeemer; but which vanish on consideration of antient times, places, manners, institutions, and figurative or hieroglyphical modes of expression. Happy they, who with pious simplicity, ask and receive, whether in the common communications of grace, or the more particular ones of the Eucharist, "abundance "of the Bread of Life, and the meat "that perisheth not." They shall grow with such aliment, "unto a perfect man, "unto the measure of the stature of the "fulness of Christ *."

The following Passages seem to confirm the Opinions contained in the Sections "on the Reference of the Lord's Prayer to the Eucharist."

ΟΥΣΙΑ est essentia, et secundum quosdam, etiam Substantia. Ουσια pro ENTE et UNO. Cicero in Platonis Timæo, ουσιαν vertit materiam, et tum επιουσιος significat super materiam—*above every thing material.*

Cicero, pro ουσια, dixit potius "natura;" ut annotat Budæus,—επιουσιος est ignitur supernaturalis.

* Ephes. iv. 13.

Expönitur

Exponitur *ουσια* etiam VIS VITALIS.

Επιουσιος, apud Suidam, *ο επι τη ουσια ημων αρμοζων. Panis nobis sustentandis idoneus*; quæ interpretatio, ait Henricus Stephanus, aptissimum quidem sensum habet (hoc in loco) sed *similis* significationis nominis "*ουσια*," *Exemplum* DESIDERO.

Quidam, in prece dominicâ, *επιουσιον*, substantialem, alii supersubstantialem, reddiderunt cum veteri interprete, seu superessentialem: Fuerunt et qui *eximium* seu *egregium* verterint,—NON VULGAREM PANEM; sed EXIMIUM ILLUM QUI DE CÆLO MITTITUR.

HEN. STEPH. LEX. in VOC. *Ουσια.*

Ambrosius, lib. v. de Sacrificiis: "Panis *επιουσιος*, hoc est, *substantialis*:"—non est iste panis, qui vadit in corpus, sed ille PANIS VITÆ ÆTERNÆ, qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit: ideo Græce *επιουσιος* dicitur.

Idem de Fide, lib. xxxvii. Επιουσιος Panis dicitur; quòd ex Verbi substantiâ substantiam virtutis manantis corpori et animæ, subministret.

Damascenus, in Epist. ad Zach. Episcopum, ait, CORPUS CHRISTI, quod in Sacramento accipitur, *εις συστασιν και εις την* ΟΥΣΙΑΝ *της ψυχης ημων χωρειν*, in constitutionem et naturam aut substantiam animæ nostræ vadere.

Sedulius understands the "Bread" in the Lord's Prayer to mean spiritual food, as appears by his verses here following:

"Annonam fidei speramus PANE DIURNO,
Ne mens nostra FAMEM DOCTRINÆ sentiat unquam,
A Christo JEJUNA suo, qui corpore et ore
Nos saturat, simul ipse manens VERBUMQUE CIBUSQUE."

Juvencius, de Hist. Evan. i. 598, translates the clause in the Lord's Prayer concerning "Bread," according to the interpretation I have endeavoured to support.

"VIT ALISQUE hodiè SANCTI substantia Panis Proveniat nobis."

Athanasius understands the *Epiousian Bread* in the Lord's Prayer, to mean a *foretaste* (in the *Eucharist*), or the *first fruits* of that FUTURE BREAD which is to be the *Heavenly food* in *another* life.

"Αλλαχου το ΑΓΙΟΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ καλει ΑΡΤΟΝ ΕΠΟΥΡΑΝΙΟΝ, λεγων "τον αρτον ημων επιουσιον δος ημιν σημερον." Εδιδαξε γαρ ημας, εν τη ευχη, εν τω νυν αιωνι, αιτειν τον επιουσιον αρτον· τουτ' εστιν, τον ΜΕΛΛΟΝΤΑ, ου απαρχην εχομεν εν τη νυν ζωη, της σαρκος του Κυριου μεταλαμβανοντες."

It is certain that the *early writers*, almost *unanimously*, explained what we translate "*daily Bread*" in the Lord's Prayer, as the CORPUS CHRISTI, emblematically received in the Eucharist. They understood it as a petition for *daily* Supplies of GRACE, spiritual aliment, or the benign influence of the HOLY SPIRIT. It was the *Primitive* practice to take the Sacrament DAILY; and hence, perhaps, the Phrase, "DAILY BREAD."

SECT.

SECTION XIX.

The Expressions of Body and Blood, as used by our Saviour, in the Institution of this Ordinance, not harsh and uncouth Figures to those who consider the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as a Feast on a Sacrifice.

If the Lord's Supper be a feast on a sacrifice, as I think it is proved to be, the expressions of eating the body and drinking the blood of our Saviour, that is, of the VICTIM SACRIFICED, are not only in a high degree *significant*, but *elegant*, and, in every respect, the most eligible that could have been used, because the most appropriate *.

Whatever

* Things are *apta* FACTA, et *apta* NATA: APTA FACTA are all such things, whether real, or nominal, or notional, as have their signification from the *outward* CONSENT of them that impose this aptness. As I know, when I hear the names London, York, or

 Dublin,

Whatever figure conveys the true idea of the speaker's mind, in the liveliest manner possible, so as to paint an IMAGE on the hearer's mind, and to effect what Quintilian calls an ENARGEIA, is an elegance. This beautiful figure of rhetoric renders what is addressed to the ears an object of mental vision *. It represents things so much to the life, that they seem to be going on before the eyes, and not merely

Dublin, what places *are*, and what places are *not*, signified and meant. Why? How comes my conception to fasten upon such a city, upon the mention of such a name? Surely from no NATURAL aptness in the names to signify one city rather than another; but by *Institution* and *consent*, or custom; which is as good as a *natural* aptness to describe such a place. Men *will* so call it; and therefore such a name *becomes* APT to each place respectively.

Thus God MADE Bread and Wine APT to express the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of his ordinance. Though these things *have* indeed *some* resemblance or congruity with the things signified, because one is a *liquid* and the other a *solid*, corresponding with the Blood and the Body, and because *both* strengthen and refresh the *Body*, as Grace strengthens and refreshes the Soul. The *appropriation* here has a *natural* as well as an *instituted aptness* to *resemble* the things signified. ROGERS on the Sacrament. 1635.

* Την ακοην οψιν ποιει. LONGINUS.

described

described by language. It forms a vivid picture on the *retina* of the mind, if I may use the expression; and not only delineates the object more clearly, but causes it to be more easily remembered. Things sensible are often not only the best but the only means of explaining, in a lively manner, things spiritual and intellectual.

It is one of the most admired kinds of the ENARGEIA not to describe a thing fully and circumstantially, but to select one or two of the most striking parts, which at once give the reader or hearer a strong and *clear impression* of the whole. Brevity adds to vivacity, one of the chief beauties of all eloquence *.

* "Ornatum est quod perspicuo et probabili plus est.—Itaque Εναργειαν, quia plus est evidentia, vel, ut alii dicunt, repræsentatio quam perspicuitas, (et illud quidem patet, hæc se quodammodo ostendit,) inter ornamenta ponamus. Magna virtus est, res, de quibus loquimur *ut cerni videantur*, enuntiare; non enim satis efficit, neque, ut debet, plene dominatur oratio, si usque ad aures volet, atque ea sibi judex, de quibus cognoscit, NARRARI credit, non EXPRIMI ET OCULIS MENTIS OSTENDI." QUINTILIAN, lib. viii. cap. 3.

"Take, eat, this is my body.—This is "my blood; drink ye all of it."

Though these words have, in modern times, sounded strangely to the ears of some, yet they were perfectly intelligible to those who heard them, and conveyed the speaker's mind with singular force. Those who heard them expressed *no surprise* at them. They knew that they referred to a feast on a sacrifice; and this was an emphatic mode of ordering it to consist of the elements of bread and wine, in the *place* of the VICTIM, which, in this case, could not for a moment be supposed, in a literal sense, to constitute the holy repast. The idea of cannibalism would have been shocking to the feelings of humanity, and cannot even now be contemplated but with abhorrence. Those who were present saw real bread and real wine in the Institutor's hand; they took them from his hand *without surprise*, when told that they were his body and his blood; because they knew he meant to establish a sacrificial feast, in analogy to their passover; in which the paschal lamb was actually eaten by

by those who were to receive the benefits of the sacrifice; and the feast was necessary to complete the sacrifice *.

I will,

* "This reference to the *customs* and *opinions* of the *times* was useful by impressing on the Religion so circumstanced one INDELIBLE MARK of truth, for the use of all ages. Had that Religion pretending to have arisen in a remote age, brought down with it no *tincture of the times*, we might have reason to suspect or disbelieve the traditional accounts which informed us of its high antiquity.

But when we find upon it so strong a mark *ancientry*; and impressed in a manner to cause no suspicion, and in a manner so sure, as to afford no handle for imposture; we may be confident it is of the *times* it pretends to be.

Again: this restrained *peculiarity* serves a still further and greater end. It is contrived to be declarative of the TRUE NATURE of the Death and Sufferings of Christ. That his Death on the Cross was a SACRIFICE for the sins of the world, has been always held a part of Catholic Faith, founded on the express declaration of Scripture. But those Sects, who oppose the doctrine of a real Redemption, have always striven to evade the notion of a *real Sacrifice*, as that on which the doctrine of Redemption is founded, upon pretence that the Scripture expressions of Christ's Sacrifice, were only *figurative* and *allusory*. Now, if the Last Supper, the rite which commemorates the Death of Christ, be of the nature of the FEASTS UPON SACRIFICE, it is self-evident that the

I will, with due humility, attempt to explain the terms to *modern* apprehensions in a liberal paraphrase.

" You and your forefathers, as well as the Gentile world, have been for ages sacrificing animals, as your most solemn act of devotion, with a hope of partaking of benefits from the propitiated Deity, by sharing in the sacrificial feast, which the victim supplied; all these sacrifices were types and adumbrations of the grand sacrifice, to be offered up for all mankind, to-morrow, by the oblation of myself on the Cross.

" In this instance, for obvious reasons, I celebrate the sacrificial feast with you *before* the sacrifice. I celebrate it with you in person, in order to give you my example and my command, in what manner you, and all that follow me, are to celebrate it after my death on the Cross; after my oblation of myself, when all sacrifices shall cease, and nothing shall remain but the *feast on the sacrifice*,

Death itself was a REAL Sacrifice, and not merely called so, by conversion of terms or accommodation of ideas."

BP. WARBURTON.

in

in which all who partake worthily shall be partakers of the benefits of the sacrifice ONCE made for you, and for all, never afterwards to be repeated.

"But in this feast which I now institute, there can be no *real blood*, no *real flesh*, as was the case when you partook of the *slaughtered animal* in the *former typical* sacrifices; for the victim, in the present case, is not one of the *animals*, is not literally a LAMB, but MYSELF, whose body will shortly ascend to Heaven, and become glorified.

"I THEREFORE ordain a feast, EMBLEMATICAL of my body and blood. I appoint the two great supplies of strength and nourishment, bread and wine, to stand in the place of the sacrificed victim; but they, duly received, shall produce the same benefits on you as you would have expected in your *former sacrifices*, when you actually fed on a *real* lamb, the offered victim; and I call them, because in effect and VIRTUE they are the *same*, my body and my blood. Do not suppose for a moment, that this is not to ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES a sacrificial feast

feast on the sacrifice of myself; but take this *bread;* for given thus, it *is*, and shall be in *effect*, my body; drink this *wine*, and it shall prove to you, in its mysterious benefits, the *real* blood of the victim, that is, of myself, to be offered up on the morrow, on the cross as on an ALTAR. The bread and wine are still but *created* things, EMBLEMS only and SYMBOLS; yet by my ordinance, they shall constitute, till my second coming, the feast on this last great sacrifice, and convey the benefits of it to all faithful and penitent partakers."

Thus understood, there appears the greatest propriety in the words, "Ye shall "eat my body and drink my blood *."

* "The *verily* and *indeed* taking of what is called by our Church an inward and spiritual Grace, must denote that the devout communicant does actually receive the benefits understood in the Gospel by the Figure of eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of Christ; that is, the confirming our trust and faith in his name, the quickening our remembrance of all he has done and suffered for us; which will naturally help and strengthen our DISPOSITION TO VIRTUOUS and GOOD ACTIONS, refresh our languid hopes in the administration of Providence, and rekindle our cooling Charity towards our fellow creatures." TUCKER. vol. vi. p. 113.

No

No mode of enunciation could have been so forcible, none so immediately adapted to point out their reference to an actual sacrifice. If he had said, you shall eat bread and drink wine after I am departed, in remembrance of your Friend and Benefactor, the duty indeed had been indispensable, and would have formed a pleasing exercise of gratitude. But we might have done the same for any other friend and benefactor, with no other benefit than the consciousness of grateful behaviour, and the pleasure of dwelling on the goodness of the departed. But by the words body and blood, we have the idea of a SACRIFICE for sinners; of the Supreme Being *propitiated* by it (according to the ideas then prevailing all over the world); of atonement made; and all the benefits of Christ's precious blood shedding, emphatically pointed out, "to our great and endless comfort."

To a people among whom sacrifices were familiar, the terms of eating the body of the victim, could not be repellent. The Jews, indeed, abstained from blood; but the institution of the Eucha-

rist

rist was not to be confined to the Jews, but in a short time extended to all people who should call on the name of Jesus; GENTILES as well as Jews, to whom sacrificial Feasts, without any prohibition from Blood, were familiar modes of conciliating the Deity, and of deriving protection and every other Blessing from Heaven; therefore the introduction of a *Feast on a Sacrifice* was the easiest and most probable method of introducing, to the Gentile world, the Christian Religion *.

* "Our Saviour did not institute a rite altogether *new* to the world: but accommodated this solemnity to the *ordinary* and *vulgar apprehensions* of all mankind, in THAT AGE." PELLING.

Certè non in hoc tantùm, sed et in Baptismi Sacramento, videtur omnino Christus se non *Hebræorum* tantùm, sed et GENTIUM, in idem Fœdus cooptandarum, Captui accommodasse. GROTIUS.

SECTION XX.

Of the true Knowledge of Christ attained in worthily receiving the Sacrament, by the unlearned and well-disposed Christian.

THERE were two trees in Paradise, the tree of knowledge and the tree of life; and if there were two such trees in the present age, many of the sons of Adam, like himself, would be most anxiously engaged in shaking the boughs of the tree of knowledge, while, thus occupied, they would wholly neglect the tree of life.

It is, indeed, a great misfortune that many teachers are *trained* to the *profession* of *divinity*, not so much by an early study of the Scriptures, or by devotional exercises; not so much by the Evangelists and Apostles, as by the Rule of Three and Practice, by Cocker's Arithmetic, Euclid's Elements, and Maclaurin's Algebra; the only things studied by many, as preparatory

tory to the first *Academical Degree*, immediately after which *Holy Orders* are taken; as if religion, which *alone* they are to profess for life, were matter of *science* entirely, whereas it is chiefly matter of *faith*. Science or *certain* knowledge, is different in its very nature from faith, which can exist only where science, or certain knowledge, is unattainable. Faith is no longer faith, the moment it becomes certain science.

It is to be attributed to the early intellectual habits of some among the students in theology who receive holy orders, without having *had time to attend closely* to any thing but MATHEMATICS, that they are willing to assent to nothing but what is nearly *demonstrable*, and explain away every thing mysterious or irreconcilable to their *preconceived* notions of truth and rectitude. This tendency would in some instances lead directly to Socinianism or Infidelity, were it not checked by a desire not to be thrown out of the *secular* benefits annexed to an established religion.

Mathematics, and all the recondite sciences, are useful and honourable attainments; but they do not teach Jesus Christ; they

they have but little connection with Theology. I must on this delicate topic rely on AUTHORITY.

"It may be hazardous," says Bishop Horne, "to assign the causes of error upon *speculation*. It is well known that most of our enlightened reasoners, who take the *highest liberties* with the faith of a *Trinity in unity*, have been bred in those schools where the *sciences*, which are conversant about QUANTITIES, claim a *superior* if not an *exclusive* excellence. In their place they are excellent, and give absolute certainty; but in religion, being out of place, they must of course turn into vain deceit. Let us, therefore, most humbly wish it to be well considered by those whom it may concern, that mathematicians, merely *as such*, have, in religion, no pre-eminence above other men; that mathematical analogies are not transferable to morality, theology, *politics*, nor to any science which is conversant only with the QUALITIES of things."

Because this subject is tender, and may possibly irritate a very irritable sort of men, those who pride themselves on their

their physical, metaphysical, and *mathematical* improvements, I must beg leave *not* to speak in my *own* words on this occasion, but in those of an author whom the *mathematical theologians* cannot but honour, —the author of the "Intellectual System."

"I wish," says Dr. CUDWORTH "while we *talk* of light, and *dispute* about truth, we could *walk* more as CHILDREN OF THE LIGHT.

"There are many *large volumes* and discourses written concerning Christ; thousands of *controversies* discussed; infinite PROBLEMS determined concerning his divinity, humanity, union of both together, and what not? So that our *book-Christians* that have *all* their religion in *writings* and *papers*, think they are now *completely* furnished with all kinds of knowledge concerning Christ: and when they see all their *leaves* lying about them, they think they have a goodly stock of knowledge and truth; as if religion were nothing but a *book-craft*, a mere *paper* skill.

"Many of the learned, if they can but *wrangle* and dispute about Christ, imagine them-

themselves to be grown great proficients in the school of Christ.

"The greatest part of the world, whether learned or unlearned, think that there is no need of purging and purifying of their hearts for the right knowledge of Christ and his Gospel; but though their lives be never so wicked, their hearts never so foul within, yet they may know Christ sufficiently out of their treatises and discourses, out of their mere *systems* and bodies of divinity,—which I deny not to be useful in a subordinate way; although our Saviour prescribeth his disciples another method to come to the right knowledge of divine truths, by doing of God's will:—"He that will do my Father's will "(saith he) shall know of the doctrine "whether it be of God." He is a true Christian indeed, not he that is only *book-taught*, but he that is *God-taught*; "He "that hath an unction from the Holy one, "(as our Apostle calleth it) that teacheth "him all things; he that hath the Spirit "of Christ within him, that searcheth out "the deep things of God: for as no man "knoweth the things of a man save the

" spirit of man which is in him; even so " the things of God knoweth no man, but " the Spirit of God."

" Ink and paper can never make us Christians; can never beget a new nature, a living principle in us: can never form Christ, or any true notion of spiritual things in our hearts. The Gospel, that new law which Christ delivered to the world, it is not merely a *letter without us*, but a *quickening spirit* within us. Cold theorems and maxims, dry and jejune disputes, *lean syllogistical reasonings*, could never yet of themselves beget the *least glimpse* of true heavenly light, the least sap of saving knowledge in any heart. All this is but the groping of the poor dark spirit of man after truth, to find it out with his own endeavours, and feel it with his own cold and benumbed hands. Words and syllables, which are but dead things, cannot possibly convey the living notions of heavenly truths to us. The secret mysteries of a divine life; of a new nature; of Christ formed in our hearts, they cannot be written or spoken;—language and expression cannot reach them;—neither can they

they ever be truly understood, except the soul itself be kindled from within, and awakened into the life of them. A painter that would draw a rose, though he may flourish some likeness of it in figure and colour, yet he can never paint the scent and fragrancy; or, if he would draw a flame, he cannot put a constant heat into his colours; he cannot make his pencil drop a sound, as the echo in the epigram mocks at him;—*si vis similem pingere, pinge sonum.* All the skill of cunning artisans and mechanics cannot put a principle of life into a statue of their own making. Neither are we able to inclose in words and letters, the life, soul, and essence of any spiritual truths, and, as it were, to incorporate it in them.

"Some philosophers have determined that αρετη is not διδακτον: virtue cannot be taught by any certain rules or precepts. Men and books may propound some directions to us, that may set us in such a way of life and practice, as in which we shall at last find it within ourselves, and be *experimentally* acquainted with it: but they cannot teach it us like a mechanic

art or trade. No surely; there is a spirit in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth this understanding. But we shall not meet with this spirit anywhere but in the way of obedience: the knowledge of Christ, and the keeping of his commandments, must always go together, and be mutual causes of one another."

Again he says: "The first Adam, as the Scripture tells us, brought in a real defilement, which, like a noisome leprosy hath overspread all mankind; and, therefore, the second Adam must really convey such an immortal seed of grace into the hearts of true believers, as may prevail still more and more in them, till it have at last quite wrought out that poison of the serpent.

"Christ, that was nothing but divinity dwelling in a tabernacle of flesh, and God himself immediately acting a human nature, came into the world to kindle here that *divine* life amongst men, which is certainly dearer to God than any thing else whatsoever in the world; and to propagate this celestial fire from one heart still unto another, until the end of the world. Neither

ther is he, nor was he, ever absent from his spark of divinity kindled amongst men, whatsoever it be, though he seem bodily to be withdrawn from us. He is the standing, constant, inexhausted fountain of this Divine Light and Heat, that still toucheth every soul that is enlivened by it with out-stretched ray, and freely lends his beams, and disperseth his influence to all, from the beginning of the world to the end of it. *We all receive of his fulness, grace for grace;"* as the planets in the heavens light their candles at the sun's flame. For though his body be withdrawn from us, yet by the lively and *virtual conduct* of his Spirit, he is always kindling, cheering, quickening, warning, and enlivening hearts. Nay, this *Divine Life* begun and kindled in any heart, wheresoever it be, *is something of God in the flesh;* and, in a sober and qualified sense, *Divinity incarnate."*

" Holiness is something of God, wherever he is; it is an efflux from him, that always hangs upon him and lives in him: as the sun-beams, though they gild this

lower world and spread their golden wings over us, yet they are not so much here where they shine, as in the sun whence they flow: Holiness is the life of God, which he cannot but feed and maintain wheresoever it is*."

The true knowledge of Christ is then to be obtained by GRACE; that efflu-ence divine into the hearts of men, which makes them little lower than the angels; pure in all their thoughts, benevolent in their sentiments, without guile in their words and actions, loving and amiable.

* See a Discourse on 1 John, chap. ii. ver. 3, 4, by R. Cudworth, D. D. preached before the House of Commons at Westminster, 1647.

The reputation of Dr. Cudworth is great, not only in this country, but among all the learned in Europe. The uncouthness of his language and the quaintness of his thoughts will not, it is hoped, disgust the delicacy of readers unaccustomed to the writings of our old divines: I think I am doing service to the cause which I am defending, whenever I can bring their arms into the field; though, it must be confessed, that they have sometimes contracted rust from the effects of time. Gold and diamonds, though long buried in the earth, lose nothing of their intrinsic value by a little incrustation. It is a pitiable fastidious-ness which loaths truth, religious truth especially, because it is presented to the mind in diction rather obsolete.

GARCE

GRACE alone can effect this high improvement of human nature. Artifice may assume the appearance of Christian virtues: human accomplishments may imitate them; but it is GRACE only that gives the reality.

But the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the instituted mode of conferring grace in a peculiar abundance. To know Christ aright, it is necessary to experience his GRACE in the emblematical Food of his divine essence. It is not necessary to discuss with mathematical nicety and metaphysical subtilty those holy mysteries, which are as far above human intellect, as the Deity who ordained them, is above human nature; But it *is* necessary to *feel* their influence.

We may read or compose volumes on commemorative rites, fœderal rites, positive rites; we may explain away every thing that is apparently difficult, and make the Gospel bend to our own wishes or preconceptions; and, after all, know less of Christ, I mean as to saving knowledge, than even the unlearned Christian, who with firm faith and with lively gra-

titude, unoffended by the difficulties of a mystery, receives Christ; that is, receives the Holy Spirit, who applies to him the benefits procured by Christ, while he partakes of the elements in the Eucharistical Communion. The cavilling disputant in theology makes the Sacrament an insignificant, lifeless ceremony; while every worthy receiver, learned or unlearned, feels it conferring on him the invaluable benefits of pardon and sanctification. The *anti-superstitions*, as it is well observed, are quite as ridiculous, and much more mischievous than the *superstitions* of the well-meaning but unlearned devotee.

"When thou comest," says the celebrated Dr. Donne, "to this seal of thy peace, the Sacrament, pray that God will give thee that light that may direct and establish thee in *fundamental* things; that is, the light of faith, to see that the body and blood of Christ are applied to thee in that action; but for the manner *how** the body and blood of Christ is there, wait his leisure. If he have not

* Profuisse deprehendas, QUOMODO profuerunt, non deprehendes. SENECA.

yet

yet manifested *that* to thee, grieve not at that; wonder not at that; press not for that: let us exercise our faith only here, and leave our disputations in the school*."

Precisely with such a disposition as Dr. Donne recommends, the multitude of Christians, who are yet untainted with the *depreciator's* doctrine, come to the Sacrament; and as they are hungry, there is every reason to believe that they are filled with good things; while, it is to be feared, "the rich," those who abound in their own sense and knowledge, "are sent empty away †."

* "If then it seem strange HOW a thing can be as *truly* REAL, *spiritually* as *carnally*; seek the Spirit of God, who is the knitter of this knot, and that will teach thee, that the *power* of the WORD, which appointed Light to be, and it was, and the evening and the morning to be a day, and it was; and man to be, and he was; did also ordain the Body and Blood of Christ to be *really* one with the elements, without *locality* or mixture, and THEREFORE, SO THEY ARE." ROGERS.

† "As the Jews, after they had offered to God in the Temple their Peace-Offerings, did eat a part in his presence, whereby they were admitted as his guests, and reconciled to him: so in the same analogy, the Eucharist is a banquet, where the faithful feed on Christ crucified; not,

not, indeed, on His *real* Body and Blood, but on the symbols which he has constituted in their stead: God is the master of the feast, and there he looks on us as his children, as reconciled to him. We enter into his Banquetting-House, and the BANNER OVER US IS LOVE."

Anon. Essay on the Lord's-Supper.

It is of great importance, while we are speaking of GRACE, and the Influence of the HOLY SPIRIT, to understand rightly the word PARACLETE.

The original word, used by our Saviour himself, is supposed to have been פרקליט "*Praklita*," a word borrowed by the Jews from the Greeks, and signifying, in the opinion of learned men, not an *advocate* or a *comforter* only, but more properly a MONITOR.

MICHAELIS.

SECT.

SECTION XXI.

The Love of Christ to Man, of Man to Christ, and of Man to Man, strikingly exhibited in the Eucharist duly celebrated.

THE rigid examiners of Christ's *pretensions* (a favourite word of such persons, and used by Bishop Hoadly on the Sacrament *,) seldom take into consideration what the Scriptures dwell upon, the *love* of God, the *love* of Christ, and the return of *love* which is due from Man to his Maker, Preserver, and Redeemer. They seem to make theology a *Scholastic* science, and exclude the fervor of piety. The AFFECTIONS, which have great sway in the cause of virtue and goodness, as well as of vice, have scarcely any place in the *meagre* systems of

* Page 106 of his *Plain Account.*

what

what I may denominate a philosophical and mathematical theology; that sort of theology which amuses a few good and ingenious men in their *libraries*, but has little effect on a world groaning under evil both moral and natural; and requiring the guidance and consolation of a *popular* religion.

Notwithstanding the cold and comfortless representations of the detractors from the dignity and benefit of Sacramental Communion, it is certain that the whole of the transaction is begun and completed in PIOUS LOVE. It is a delightful exercise of the finest affections or sensibilities of the human soul. The name Eucharist signifies the expression of *gratitude*, always a pleasing office, and more especially delightful, when shewn to the God who is love itself, and multiplies his benefits in proportion, as they are gratefully acknowledged. This holy feast after the Sacrifice, the great Sacrifice once made, as a full, perfect, and sufficient oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, is a luxurious

banquet

banquet for the soul, in which it is gratified with Love, Joy and Peace *.

It was commanded in the law of Moses, "Thou shalt rejoice in thy feasts "before the Lord †;" and surely if the

* Mihi ante omnia, et supra omnia SUMMA DULCEDO. ROM. Missal.

† JANSENIUS autem eam Christi Gratiam, quæ hominem jam boni cognitione illustratum, et variis modis pulsatum, allectum et sollicitatum, ut bonum amplectatur, ad illud tandem reapse prosequendum efficacitèr et certò determinat, non aliud esse vult, quam CÆLESTEM QUANDAM ATQUE INEFFABILEM SUAVITATEM, seu SPIRITUALEM DELECTATIONEM, quâ voluntas prævenitur et flectitur ad volendum faciendumque quicquid Deus eam velle et facere constituerit. Nec enim ullum esse genus actionis aut voluntatis bonæ, ullumve effectum Gratiæ efficacis, qui non isti Cælesti DELECTATIONI, tanquam veræ gratiæ Christi, verœque causæ tribuendum sit. Illam esse, per quam bonum quod prædicatur nobis, incipimus concupiscere: per quam bonum jam cogitatum piâ voluntate credimus atque suscipimus. Sine cœlitus infusâ ejusmodi DELECTATIONE, nec orationem ullam Deo gratam fundi posse, nec Deum pure et castè diligi, nec cupiditatum nostrarum tentationibus resisti, nec denique ullum bonum opus fieri. Ut prolixè Doctor ille ex Augustino probare contendit.

JANSENIUS De gratia Christi Salvatoris, Libro 4. cap. 1. et seq.

† Deut. xvi. 11.

Jews

Jews had cause to rejoice at their paschal feast, in memory of their deliverance from the house of bondage, their state of slavery in Egypt, Christians must feel delight in commemorating the mercy of God in sending the Son of his Love, out of his bosom, *to redeem them from the chains of sin and death.* St. Luke, in the Acts, gives us a pleasing account of the behaviour of the first Christians in celebrating the Lord's Supper:—"And "they, continuing with one accord in "the Temple, and breaking bread in the "house *, (in the place of their religious "assemblies,) did eat their meat with "GLADNESS and singleness of heart, "praising God, and having favour with "all the people †." Consistently with the idea of joy as the predominant sentiment at the Eucharist, we are taught in our Communion office to break out in the following words with rapture: "With "angels and archangels, and with all "the company of Heaven, we laud and "magnify thy glorious name, evermore

* So it should be translated. † Acts, ii. 16.

"praising

" praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy,
" holy, Lord God of Hosts, heaven and
" earth are full of thy glory. Glory be
" to thee, O Lord most High." And again: " We praise thee, we bless thee,
" we worship thee, we glorify thee, we
" give thanks to thee for thy great glory,
" O Lord God, Heavenly King, God, the
" Father Almighty."

These words are expressions of the warmest feelings of love, gratitude, and adoration. They who repeat them without such feelings are so far guilty of hypocrisy; to avoid which it is necessary to raise the mind to a high degree of ardour or fervency; a purpose rendered difficult, if not impossible to be accomplished by the refrigerating doctrines of those who *undervalue* the holy rite. We must endeavour to feel, with due force, the love of Christ towards us; and love will produce love. We are commemorating the greatest instance of love that possibly could exist:—" Greater love hath
" no man than this, that a man lay down
" his life for his friend:"—but we, as sinners,

sinners, were enemies,—" And * God com-
" mendeth his love towards us, in that,
" while we were yet sinners, Christ died
" for us†." Such words should not be carelessly repeated, but laid to heart, after serious consideration of their full force and significancy. How great would have been our wretchedness if he had not shewn us this love? but as he has shewn it, we have reason to believe that he will continue it; and with himself freely give us all things—an exalted state of bliss and perfection, in a future and glorified existence.

Thus the worthy communicant experiences in the Eucharist, the truth of St. John's declaration:—" God is love; and

* Rom. v. 8.

† The EUCHARIST is an expression of GRATITUDE. " Instead of slaying of beasts and burning Insence, whereby they called on the name of the Lord in the Old Testament, the Fathers believed our Saviour ordained this Sacrifice of Bread and Wine as a rite whereby to GIVE THANKS and make supplication to his Father in HIS NAME." JOSEPH MEDE.

It was therefore called Ευχαριστια, or the Sacrament of Thanksgiving or GRATITUDE.

He

"he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in "God, and God in him *." He has a prelibation † of the happiness of Heaven; for

* 1 John, iv. 8.

† "I speak here of that soft, calm satisfaction which every good man feels more or less in the conscientious discharge of his duty, and of this duty in particular above all others. And I may appeal to the experience of all faithful Christians, whether in the performance of it they do not find a pleasure infinitely superior to all earthly enjoyments, and a peace within their own breasts, which the world cannot give. For I do not mean, by what I have said above, those transports of joy, even to extacy, which are only constitutional, and which some enthusiastical persons have felt (or at least have given out that they have felt) in the exercise of the grossest superstition, and which many of the same complexion have experienced likewise in the best Religion, who yet have been persons of none of the best morals, but rather wholly devoid of the spiritual life. It is sometimes possible, indeed, that God Almighty may, for the encouragement of young beginners in religion, give them extraordinary tastes of the pleasures that are to be had in it, as he has sometimes done to persons exposed to very great trials and dangers for the sake of their virtue, which was in some measure the case of David, and especially that of St. Paul, who was caught up into the third Heaven, 2 Cor. xii. 4. But as we have at present no certain mark in these sensible joys themselves to distin-

for in what can that happiness consist, if not in a holy joy, in a refined love, gratified with the society and favour of the SUPREME EXCELLENCE, which the soul delights in, as congenial to its original and unpolluted nature.

Man is so constituted, that unless he is impelled by some AFFECTION, he becomes inactive and listless, though his understanding at the same time be convinced of the propriety of strenuous exertion. The spur of inclination is necessary to religious, as well as to moral, social, civil, or political activity. It is pride, avarice, or voluptuousness, which fill our streets, our emporiums, our theatres, with all the bustle of business and alacrity of motion.

guish what really comes from the Spirit of God, from what may be the natural effect only of a sanguine and lively constitution, we may say, in general, that the best and least equivocal evidence we can have of a sincere piety, is to be formed from the vigorous and uninterrupted efforts we make to obey the will of God in all things, and not from transports and extacies, which come upon us, we know not why or wherefore."

Essay on the Lord's Supper.

A more

A more refined affection than these, DEVOTIONAL LOVE, must fill our churches, and crowd our tables of Sacramental Communion: and it is right to excite an ardour of this kind, to counteract the ardours which the WORLD and its vanities never fail to kindle.

Accordingly our Saviour, intimately acquainted with human nature, has comprehended almost the whole of his religion in the affection of love or charity. He taught nothing of scholastic refinement or academical theology: love is the beginning, the middle, and the end of his philanthropic code. To the lawyer who asked him which was the great commandment in the law, he answered, "Thou shalt "love the Lord thy God with all thy "heart, and with all thy soul, and with "all thy mind: this is the first and great "commandment; and the second is like "unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour "as thyself."

The Eucharist indispensably requires, and greatly increases this love in us, both to

God and man ; for it unites the hearts of all who communicate in the strictest bond of amity. Our Lord, in an affectionate discourse, when near his death, and at the very time of instituting the Sacrament, says, "This is my commandment, that "ye love one another, as I have loved "you: a new commandment I give you, "that ye love one another; even as I have "loved you, that ye also love one ano-"ther." The *Communion of the body and blood of Christ* unites the Communicants or receivers into one body. The Apostle expressly says,—"For we, being many, "are one bread and one body, for we "are all partakers of that one bread." He who comes to the table with a heart full of envy, hatred, and malice, may indeed eat the bread and drink the wine with others, but he does not, and cannot, communicate either with God or man.

But the blessed Sacrament, worthily received, reconciles God to Man, and man to man. Considered in its just light, it is a feast of love, and contributes to the

the happiness of this life *, while it tends to secure it in a better. The disposition is softened by it; and man comes from the Communion Table into society with a heart filled with those kind and friendly sentiments which, more than any thing else sweeten the intercourse of human life. He comes from the Communion Table with that PURITY, which tends immediately to promote and preserve INNOCENCE.

* The Heathens made their religious Sacrifices subservient to the purposes of family love and unity:

Proxima cognati dixêre CHARISTIA chari,
Et venit ad socias turba propinqua Dapes.
INNOCUI veniant; procul hinc, procul IMPIUS esto.
——————————CONCORDIA fertur
Illo precipuè mitis adesse Die.
Et libate dapes: ut grati Pignus Honoris,
Nutriat incinctos MISSA PATELLA Lares.
Jamque ubi suadebit placidos nox humida Somnos,
Parca precaturæ sumite vina manus:
Et bene nos, Patriam, bene te, Pater optime, Cæsar,
Dicitè *suffuso*, sint rata verba, *mero*.

OVID.

Finito CONVIVIO, Græci hauriebant Poculum
ΔΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΓΑΘΟΥ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΟΣ.

ATHENÆUS.

" Inter omnia CONVIVIA FŒDERALIA principem merito locum, augustissimum religiosissimumque illud

Epulum

Epulum Dominicum obtinet, in quo quidem Christiani partim ejusdem panis vinique externâ corporeâque degustatione, partim unius ejusdemque corporis sanguinisque Christi spirituali, quæ per Fidem fit, Communione, sacrosanctum illud suum inviolabileque Fœdus, quo et cum Deo, et inter se sunt conjuncti, ipsius Christo pretiosissimo sanguine percussum, testari sanctè religiosèque solent. Et quænam sanctior, religiosior, augustior fœderis, amicitiæ, charitatisque nostræ, quâ cum Deo et nobiscum invicèm conjuncti sumus, attestatio, sanctiove, dici aut excogitari potest?

Unde apparet quàm diro inexpiabilique perfidiæ crimine sese obstringant omnes ii, qui datam hanc publice, in sacrosancto illo Convivio, Deo Hominibusque Fidem, impiè et nefariè frangunt; et cum ipsum Deum sceleratâ flagitiosaque vivendi consuetudine, tum homines quosvis, quâvis datâ et oblatâ occasione, injuriis violandi, odia, contentiones, inimicitias excitandi, ac pacem concordiamque, cum PUBLICAM tum PRIVATAM, perturbandi, nullum finem faciunt.

Quod si Christiani, eâ, quâ par est, Reverentiâ assiduè SACROSANCTUM ILLUD EPULUM animis suis revolverent, non toties tantisque odiis aut inimicitiis flagrarent; et fœdera, pacem, amicitiam, fidem, concordiamque mutuam, etiamsi nulla alia juramenta, sanctionesque intercederent,) sanctissimè religiosissimè que observarent que colerent."

STUCKII. Antiq. Conv.

This Author is of opinion with me, that if all, who *call themselves Christians*, were, with *due consideration*, to take this Holy Sacrament; and, with *proper affections*, (such

(such as become Christians above all others,) to join together in this sacred and brotherly banquet; the EUCHARIST would be the means of establishing and securing UNIVERSAL PEACE, PUBLIC, as well as PRIVATE, throughout all Christendom.

It is wonderful with what RANCOUR and ANIMOSITY, persons, calling themselves Christians, will express their hatred against the PERSONS of INDIVIDUALS; who, in the vicissitudes of human affairs, become PUBLIC enemies; and how little they seek PEACE (if they seek it all) in the SPIRIT OF PEACE. The sanctimonious Pretenders to Religion, when they think WAR advantageous to their political party, are the last to forgive.

SECTION XXII.

Of the Opinion that the POSITIVE *Duties of Christianity may be neglected, without incurring Blame, by those who observe the* MORAL *Duties.*

THE social duties of Man to Man appear to be considered by some as the *sum* and *substance* of Christianity. Such duties as the reception of the Eucharist are called POSITIVE, and mentioned with contempt by many in comparison with moral duties. "I may surely be excused from forms and ceremonies," says the self-complacent moral philosopher, "while I take care to possess and practice the essentials of virtue; while I pay my debts, do no harm to anybody, and add my mite, when I think proper, to the contributions raised in support of public and approved charities: I am a Christian; for I was baptized in my infancy, and my parents were such before

before me; but, with respect to mysterious doctrines or ordinances, I shall not trouble myself with what I do not understand, but be contented with acting a just, beneficent, and honourable part in the society in which I was placed by *fortune*. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper I number among positive and formal duties, if it is to be numbered among duties at all, and consider it as inferior in value to the virtues which I daily practice in the common intercourse of life. I leave it therefore to zealots, to enthusiasts, and to formalists; and maintain, that I may be, and am, a good Christian without it."

On this soliloquy, which has all the plausibility of worldly wisdom, I have only to observe, that whoever utters it may be a scholar of Socrates or Epictetus, but not of Jesus Christ. For, whatever moral virtues we may possess, HE expressly declares, "Except we eat the flesh of the "Son of Man, and drink his blood, we have no life in us;" that is, unless we partake the benefits of the grand sacrifice on the Cross, by partaking of, the feast upon it, instituted by Christ himself, we have no

no spiritual life, no assistance of the Holy Ghost, no exemption from death eternal. What will our soliloquist's morality do to supply that, without which, our Saviour says, we can have no spiritual life? Is the soliloquist sure that his moral virtues are sound and sincere? The heart is deceitful and may flatter him, as it has many, with a self-approbation, not founded on merit, but on pride.

I would say to him, "Add *divinity* to *pure* morality and you will animate a beautiful body with the warmth and vigour of life; divest morality of divinity, separate it from all connection with *the will of God*, and you leave it a specious form, indeed, but comparatively lifeless and insubstantial. Divinity, like the sun in the world of nature, cherishes a vital principle of the soul, promotes its growth, and raises it to full maturity."

The Gospel teaches morality; all the discourses of those who preach the Gospel inculcate morality; every doctrine of our religion is connected with morality; but then it is a morality invigorated, sublimed, and refined by divinity, by a pious deference,

ference to the God who made us, and can destroy us forever.

Morality, independent of divinity, considers man as related *only* to man; but man is also related to God, as a stream to its fountain; and his most important duties originate from that relation.

Morality, independent of divinity, seems to view man as an inhabitant of *this world* only; but the Sacraments, as Dr. Waterland observes, "raise the mind higher, even to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to angels and archangels, and the whole host of heaven, tending to produce dispositions proper for living in conjunction, or union, with *that* blessed society. So that, with respect at least to the life to come, the Sacraments have the *advantage* over other duties called moral, forming the mind to higher views, and being more *perfective of man's nature.* In secular, or worldy duties, secularity or worldly-mindedness is apt to creep in too much, and it is not very easy always, in performing them, to keep the heart and mind intent upon God, or to perform them upon a purely religious principle. But in the

the devout observance of the Sacraments, the mind is lifted up from earthly things, and is more abstracted from the world; on which account, these duties are *preferable*, as forming in us dispositions proper for a heavenly state."

The lukewarm and disputatious still argue against the value and importance of *positive* duties; that is, of duties of divine appointment; duties instituted by revelation only, and such as would not have been suggested to the human mind by reason undirected or unassisted.

Such are Baptism and the Eucharist. These are *positive rites*, and peculiar to Christianity. But human nature requires positive rites, both as memorials, and as excitements of devotion. Our Saviour, knowing human nature by his divine intuition, and likewise by his assumption of it, complied with its feelings, expectations, and prepossessions. But in the place of the numerous ceremonies of Heathenism, burthensome in themselves, and apt to turn the attention from the business of devotion, rather than promote it, Christ established but TWO, both of them strongly significant;

significant; *Baptism*, significant of cleansing from polution by water, and the *Eucharist*, of expiation by a sacrificed victim. The minds of men, in every part of the world, were *prepared* for the reception of such rites by previous notions, habits, and forms of SACRIFICIAL Service.

When thus *instituted* by divine authority, though not suggested by reason, who, without presumption can say, that they are not of universal obligation; or, that they are inferior in value and importance to moral duties *?

The Christian who depreciates the Sacraments because they are *positive*, or instituted rites, depreciates obedience

* L'Eucharist nourrit et fortifie *toutes les Vertus Chretiennes*; elle donne une Idée vive et sensible de la Peine que merite le PECHE: ainsi la douleur d'l avoir commis doit etre profonde.

L'EUCHARISTE EST LE PLUS GRAND BIEN QU'ON PUISSE RECEVOIR SUR LA TERRE.

Enfin, il n'y a point de Faveur si precieuse, que ce Sacrament ne nous confere. Toutes les Graces qu'on peut souhaiter sont les fruits de la Mort de Jesus Christ. En recevant le Sacrament, on participe a la Mort de Jesus Christ: on est donc in droit de pretendre a la possession de TOUTES LES GRACES, et de tous les Tresors de Glorie, qui sont inseparable de cette Mort, et de ce Sacrament. BASNAGE.

to

to the Sovereign Ruler of the universe. Let him beware lest, instead of serving the cause of morality, which he professes to honour, he should weaken the ties of all moral obligation; for he who treats obedience to an express command of God, as a duty which may be slighted in any instance, will, I should think, be very apt to disregard his duty to man, when the neglect is consistent with worldly interest, and with temporal impunity.

Positive duties have a tendency to bind all other duties upon us more closely; because they *recognize a living supreme* GOVERNOR, while the moral duties, according to some among the modern philosophers, originate from the dictates of *reason and nature*, (interpreted by *themselves*) without the *immediate interference* of the Deity. Morality becomes a flexible rule to many, when it is left unfixed by a divine sanction.

Both positive and moral duties must be held in high veneration by every sincere and consistent Christian. Both must be observed with a conscientious punctuality. The observation of the *moral* will

will not excuse, in a professed Christian, the neglect of the positive.

To every Christian the Sacraments must appear positively commanded; and will *disobedience* to a divine command be compensated by prudential and virtuous manners in the common conduct or intercourse of life? on the contrary, will not this *disobedience* to positive commands vitiate a course of behaviour, in other respects, as far as men can see, pure and good? We must not form our conduct solely with a view to the world's approbation, but the approbation of the Deity; and the Deity, it is probable, must be *particularly* offended with disobedience to a *direct* order, like that which enjoins the Sacrament. "This do in remembrance of me!" To be capable of disobeying God, when the command is clear, argues a mind very little inclined to *morality*, I should think, in the ordinary transactions of human life.

But it is unjust to affirm that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is merely a positive duty unconnected with morality. It requires great virtues, faith, hope, charity

charity, and humility, for its worthy reception. It requires a frame of mind favourable to every virtue which improves and embellishes society. It cannot be received without an abhorrence of every injurious quality, without a disposition to every thing virtuous and laudable. The worthy reception of it is not merely a means of virtue, but a virtue in itself of the highest order. Wranglers may dispute on the comparative value of positive and moral duties; but the man who is a worthy Communicant will act in such a manner as to leave his goodness and virtue in social life, as the result of his Communion, a matter which admits of no controversy.

For the sake, however, of those who puzzle themselves with the intricacies of disputation concerning positive and moral duties, instead of acting in obedience to a divine command, from the sentiments of a good and simple heart, I will add a passage from Dr. Waterland; from which it will appear that the obligation to positive duties is as strong as to moral.

"If," says he, "God's command in moral

moral duties constitute duty and virtue, then, of consequence, God's command in matters of a positive nature consitutes duty and virtue also; and, therefore, our obedience in either case, resolves into the same principle, and has the same common ground of obligation. God's reasons for commanding may be different; but our reasons for obeying are the *same*. Reasons of the *law* are one thing; and reasons of the obligation are another. A law should not want its reasons; but yet it is the law and not those reasons, that creates the *obligation*; for the law would oblige, though we knew nothing of the reasons on which it is founded. Positive duties, therefore, and moral, are alike obligatory, as enjoined by the same authority and enforced by the same sanctions. Both proceed from the same infinite Goodness, and both lead to the same infinite happiness; which is sufficient to infer equal obligation, when other circumstances are equal. Moral duties arise from the will or command of God founded on the *known* and *standing* reason of things; positive duties from the

will or command of God, founded on *occasional* reasons, known perhaps TO GOD ALONE. In moral laws we see the reasons *first*, and by these we come to the knowledge of the law; which method of investigation has probably occasioned the mistake of supposing the reasons obligatory antecedently to the law, though they are proofs only that there is and must be a law suitable; in positive laws we know the laws first, and afterwards the reasons, (so far as we at all know them) and so nobody suspects an obligation prior to the laws."

Therefore, (to proceed with the same excellent man's sentiments, if not exactly in his words,) let *religion* and *morality* go hand in hand. Let not faith be opposed to morality, nor morality to faith. Let not moral duties be extolled to the neglect of positive; nor positive to the neglect of moral. Let God be loved in the first place; and men for God's sake, in the second, as God has *ordained*. Let the Christian Sacraments be held in the esteem as *divine ordinances*, and as the springs of the *spiritual life; both productive* of moral

moral virtues and *perfective* of them. Lastly, let all extremes be avoided, and the true medium fixed between enthusiasm and superstition on one hand, and irreligion or prophaneness on the other; so that all may terminate in *glory* to God and *good* to man.

SECTION XXIII.

The Observation of Ritual Ordinances, conducive, in a high Degree, to the salutary Purposes of Religion.

THE majority of mankind are so constituted as to render it difficult to teach them spiritual things without sensible images. It is not, indeed, desirable, if it were possible, that any nation should consist entirely of philosophers: the plough, the loom, the mill, the hammer, the axe, the waggon, and the ship, would stand still, if all men were capable of, and addicted to *refined* contemplation. But those who are employed in the mechanical works of agriculture and merchandize, are no less interested in religious doctrines, as far as they are effective of salvation, than the professors of theology. To preserve the sense of religion among the mass of mankind, it is necessary, that there should be public buildings appropriated to divine service,

service, and rites and ceremonies established in them; with objects PALPABLE TO THEIR SENSES, actions strikingly expressive, even decorous vestments, differing from those in common use, and every thing else that can fix the attention to the *main business;* to the offices of devotion, and to the lessons of religious instruction. Indeed, whatever intellectual pride may suggest, ALL men, however improved, are susceptible of great and desirable effects from the external ceremonies of religion. It has pleased Providence to make the avenues to the soul lead through the organs of sensation.

Those who *dissent* from the established Church, however far they have thought proper to recede from the vanity of Roman Catholic ceremony, yet retain some solemnities in their external modes of worship, calculated to inspire a religious reverence. Their ministers usually wear *black* garments; they have edifices set apart for worship, and several of them administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper with great solemnity. The Quakers, who recede the farthest from the Church, meet in places appropriated to worship, retain a very re-

markable distinction of dress at all times, and add something to it, I believe, when an instructress delivers admonitions to the congregation. But if this were not the case, their exception would not contravene the decisions of a great majority of mankind in favour of ceremonies, in all ages, and in every climate:—It is the voice of nature that approves them; and revelation has not prohibited but encouraged them, especially by the examples recorded in the Old Testament. I hope, therefore, that no man will think himself a promoter of religion and a benefactor of society, by divesting the rites of the Christian religion which still remain among the reformed, of their power to excite awe, to banish worldly ideas, and to prepare the mind for spiritual improvement. Whoever employs his reasoning faculties and his learning to such a purpose, displays his *want* of philosophy, his *want* of knowledge of human nature, no less than the coldness of his devotional sentiments.

A caviller of antiquity maintained, that a GROVE consecrated to religious worship, and inspiring by its gloomy grandeur a religious awe, was nothing more than a plan-

tation

tation of timber trees *. Every man of common sense knows as well as he, that it was but a wood; but every man of common sense, knew also that, by an association of ideas, a GROVE as well as a piece of architecture, may constitute in effect a TEMPLE, and *contribute* to inspire the mind with sentiments favourable to devotion.

There never can be many, among the myriads that form the mass of human beings, who will not be *affected* by associating religious ideas with *material forms* properly adapted to the purpose; but the attempt to *prevent* such an *affection* is always mischievous as far as it is successful. It robs the mind of a great and pure pleasure, and has a tendency to produce infidelity or atheism. It seems paradoxical, but, I believe, experience will prove, that a man may *reason* himself by sophistical cavilling, not only out of all his comforts, all his virtues, all his religion, but out of common sense.

Heavenly things are so far above all human languages, that it is necessary to

* *Lucum* Ligna. HOR.

attempt a supply of the defect by allusive imagery, by hieroglyphical figures, by ritual performances; and, to speak more particularly to our present purpose, by the elements of bread, of wine, and water, in the two Sacraments. Nor can I think the man entitled to the renown of peculiar sagacity, who, with much self-applause, sits down to inform the world that bread used in the rite is but grain; that wine is but the juice of the grape; and that water, only *particles of matter* so formed as to yield and change their places on the slightest motion.

These SIGNS are the language of our RELIGION, who does not express herself by sounds only, differing in their meaning in different nations of the earth, but by MATERIAL Substances, which, rightly used, are *significant* to *all men*, and form an UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE. Let us revere the signs for the sake of the things signified, which are so transcendent in their nature, as to exceed all power of words formed by human articulation. It may not be improper to advert in this place to the well-known circumstance, that signs were the favourite modes

modes of expressing ideas or thoughts in the Oriental countries whence our religion derived its origin. Information by *actions* and *images* was not in those regions confined to religious topics, but was a familiar made of common conversation, and almost general in matters political, philosophical, and theological. Neither has the mode of speaking by *signs* and *actions* ceased in *this* age. Did not the inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific Ocean, unacquainted with our language, hold out *branches*, when they intended to signify their peaceful intentions to their European visitors, approaching in tremendous floating castles to their unprotected shore? The branches *spoke* and were understood, while their language (if it could have been heard at the distance described) would have *wanted an interpreter*, who could not have been procured; and would have been comparatively *slow* and feeble in expressing the *general* wish for peace and amity.

Symbols, emblems, tropes, allegories, fables, expressive actions; all these are used, and must of necessity be used, on *some occasions* to supply the defect of language.

language. Their use in the Sacrament is in every respect highly proper. They have *spoken* with effect to millions of the human race, who understood them well, who received solace from them, in the pilgrimage of life, and who, in consequence of them, laid themselves down at the close of life, to sleep in peace, and with the hope of a blessed immortality.

SECTION XXIV.

Of the Attempts of learned Divines of the Church of England to disprove the Necessity *of* Preparation *for the Sacrament; or, to render it slight and superficial.*

The detractors from the dignity of the Eucharist proceed, consistently with their general design, to deny the necessity, and to doubt even the *expediency* of preparation. According to *their* notions of a *worthy* reception, it consists in a *decent deportment* during the time of the solemnity. Bishop Hoadly says, "Examination is *not* a duty necessary previous to the Lord's Supper; and the *whole affair* (such are his words) of eating and drinking unworthily, is confined to the frame of our minds and our behaviour

AT

AT the very time of our performance of this religious duty."

Bishop Pearce denies that St. Paul's exhortation, "Let a man *examine* himself, "and so let him eat of the bread and "drink of the cup," *seems to relate to* ANY EXAMINATION *of what sins they had been formerly guilty of.* "If," continues he, "to eat and drink unworthily be to do it intemperately and without reverence, the phrase "Let a man *examine* himself," must signify to do it *reverently.*" He asserts that the Greek word* does not signify let him *examine*, but let him distinguish himself from a guest at a common meal: and this difference consists in receiving the Sacrament with *reverence*; with a consideration of the end of the institution, namely, a *remembrance* of Christ's death, and love and affection for our brethren. I must here remark, that Bishop Taylor, a much greater man, says, "That the Greek word here translated *examine*, signifies the *strictest sort of trial* or exa-

* Δοκιμαζετω Εαυτον.

mination,

mination, such as that by which gold is *tried* by the fire."

Dr. Balguy says: "The necessity of the self-examination may first, perhaps, have been suggested by a *mistaken* interpretation of a passage in one of St. Paul's Epistles; and ought not to be dissembled, that there is no passage in Scripture, which expressly requires it of us as a condition of receiving the Sacrament." Dr. Balguy however allows the *propriety* of it; but why should men exert their ingenuity in disproving the necessity of a conduct which they allow to be proper. The *necessity* appears from St. Paul's words in our translation, which scholars of great ability think the right one.

Dr. Bell does not desert the cause which he had undertaken in his "Practical Inquiry," when he comes to instruct the unlearned Christian concerning *preparation*. He teaches, that habitual good intentions, joined to the serious employment of our thoughts *at the time*, in the business we are about, will, in *every instance*, render our *attendance* upon the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as well as

the

the performance of every other act of religious worship, an acceptable service without setting apart any *precise period* of time to prepare ourselves for it. As to any *precise time* for preparation, I know of nobody who ever said, that the limitation to a particular length of time was necessary. But duties for which no *particular* time is set apart, are apt to be performed at *no time*: and where is the necessity or propriety of contending against a precise time for preparation; if any well-disposed Christian think the appointment of a precise time conducive to this pious purpose? All these attempts to prevent either the preparation in general, or the fixing of a precise time for it in particular, contribute to make men consider the Sacrament as an insignificant rite, which may be performed without advantage, or neglected without any evil consequence.

A Bishop of Winchester, with his Archdeacon, and Prebendary; and a Bishop of Rochester, with a Prebendary of Westminster, contending against the necessity of preparation for the Sacrament, are sufficient to confound, if not to convince the unlearned

unlearned reader *. What the late worthy Bishop of St. Asaph, Dr. BAGOT, says to the Prebendary of Westminster, Dr. Bell, in an excellent remonstrance upon the subject, might have been addressed to them ALL with propriety †.

"Your estimation in the world," says he, "will of course give a certain degree of credit to every thing you publish. The generality of readers will be little disposed to suspect either your intentions, or your prudence. It becomes, on this account, the *more necessary*, that whatever proceeds from your pen should be scrupulously examined. The established worship of this country has a claim to some deference and respect from her *own sons* at least; from those especially who are engaged in her service by the solemn professions, *who*

* Benjamin Hoadly Bishop of Winchester, Thomas Balguy, D. D. Archdeacon and Prebendary of Winchester, Zachary Pearce, Bishop of Rochester, and William Bell, D. D. Prebendary of St. Peter's, Westminster.

† See a Letter to Dr. Bell on the subject of his late publication on the authority, nature, and design of the Lord's Supper, by Lewis Bagot, D. D.

live

live of the Sacrifice, and eat of the milk of the flock.

"Our Blessed Lord hath enjoined two solemn and significant rites for perpetual observance in the Church. To understand these aright, and conscientiously to practice them in perfect agreement with the intention of their Great Author, must be an object of the utmost consequence to every individual Christian, whatever his rank or attainments may be.

"Neither your principles nor arguments are *new*; they have been uniformly adopted by all *Socinian* writers on the subject. It is true likewise, that these principles, by whomsoever adopted, are themselves utterly inconsistent with the public doctrines and service of the established Church.

"What can the *poor man* think, or how can he act, with his Common-Prayer Book in one hand, for which he hath all his life entertained a just veneration; and in the other, Dr. Bell's Practical Enquiry, which assures him that his Prayer-Book hath hitherto deceived him, and led him to

to pervert the most solemn institution of his Saviour *?

"Surely it is a very serious matter to trifle thus with the consciences of men; and can only tend to weaken that influence of religious principle, which still operates among us; though, God knows, with less power, and to less extent, than might be wished.

"Your "Practical Enquiry" calls for notice; and the unlearned believers, on whom it is imposed, ought to be warned of the danger of it. It is yet in your power, and I am convinced it is your duty, to suppress it yourself. The religious peace and comfort of thousands may be affected by it."

Thus far Bishop BAGOT, with a zeal and moderation which do him honour. The "Practical Enquiry" is not yet *suppressed*. The *third edition* of it, just purchased, lies before me; and, if its doctrines were so dangerous as Bishop Bagot represents them to have been many years ago, how much more so at the present day, when

* See Bell's "Practical Enquiry," Question 37.

the example of apostasy on the neighbouring Continent has caused infidelity to triumph in every part of Europe.

The imitators of Bishop Hoadly, on the Sacrament, seem to me particularly injudicious, and injurious to the cause of virtue and religion, when, like him, they *discourage* PREPARATION. Considered in the lowest sense, preparation for the Sacrament furnishes a fine opportunity for improvement in MORALITY*. The mind, at stated times, retires within itself; reviews its habits and passions, endeavours to correct whatever is found wrong, and forms resolutions for future undeviating rectitude: a most philosophical as well as religious exercise; such as would be approved in the school of Epictetus as well as of Christ; and such as no man, who has just conceptions of the

* Hoc nos pessimos facit, quod nemo vitam suam respicit. SENECA Epist. 38.

The Pythagorean Philosophers called themselves to account every night for the actions of the day.

Μη δ' υπνον μαλακοισιν επ' ομμασι προσδεξαθαι
Πριν των ημερινων εργων τρις εκαστον επελθειν.
Πη παρεβην; τι δ' ερεξα; τι μοι δεον ουκ ετελεσθη.

present

present state of human nature, would wish to discountenance.

Why should DIVINES, of all men, take pains to teach that preparation is not necessary? While men think it *necessary*, they will certainly not neglect it entirely; but, once prove to them that it is a superfluous work, and they will lay aside the practice, notwithstanding they may acknowledge it useful, as a MORAL EXERCISE. Take away the idea of awe and veneration attached to the Eucharist, and men, in general, will not trouble themselves to withdraw from worldly cares, and meditate in silence and solitude on the state of their minds, and the course of their moral and religious conduct: much less will they truly repent, when *theologians* of great rank in the Church, and great reputation for abilities, intimate, in plain terms, that the preparation usually recommended, has crept into use merely by the misrepresentation of those who knew not the real nature of the Sacrament, or, who gratified some selfish purpose of their own, by deluding the weak and the uninformed.

I assert not that any *limited* time is

prescribed for preparation by scriptural authority. I do not maintain the necessity of any *peculiar* form or system of preparation. But, to the propriety of preparation in *general*, the sense of all Christendom has given its sanction; and they are mischievously employed who teach men to slight it; the consequence of which will be an entire neglect of it, and of the Sacrament that should follow it. If there were no Sacrament, or no benefits annexed to the Sacrament, yet a moral exercise, like that of pious persons preparing for a religious act of great solemnity, would be in the highest degree beneficial. I can therefore see no good reason for any attempt to recommend the discontinuance of a practice, not only perfectly innocent, but very salutary.

If *mere remembrance* of a deceased benefactor, and *attention* at the celebration of the rite, constitute a worthy receiver; then a bad man who commands his thoughts for half an hour at the Communion Table may be a better, or worthier, communicant than a very good man, who, from the involuntary wandering of his mind, may be off his

his guard *for a moment*, though he comes prepared with faith, repentance, and charity. If unseemly behaviour at the *time of celebration* be all that is meant by unworthy receiving (as the depreciators sometimes contend) then it is scarcely possible in *our* Churches to receive unworthily; for a man who should behave indecently would either be turned out by the beadle, or rejected by the minister.

Doctrines and opinions so absurd would hardly require refutation, if they were not obtruded on the multitude by artful means, and recommended by an imposing authority *.

* On the subject of *Examination* previously to the reception of the Sacrament, the following passage from an old and sensible Divine is worthy observation.

"The Apostle's word "*Examine*" is understood by the learned in three different senses, 1st. Some understand it as a metaphorical expression taken from the art of the goldsmith, trying the purity of his gold; δοκιμαζειν being a proper word to them in the exercise of their art; as in 1 Pet. i. 7. Ινα το ΔΟΚΙΜΙΟΝ υμων της πιστεως πολυ τιμιωτερον χρυτιου.

2ndly. Others, because Bread and Wine taken in the Sacrament are both Food and Physic, insist on the similitude of a physician, giving *preparatives* to his patient before the exhibition of the *efficient* medicine.

3dly. The greater part consider the word *examine* as a *verbum forense et juridicum*; as the *Magistrate* examines or *questions* an offender.

The latter appears to be most consonant to the Apostle's sense.

The man who examines himself must personate three several parts; the offender, the accuser, the judge. Conscience must be the accuser, and reason the judge, who, *secundum allegata et probata*, will acquit or condemn.

The interrogations upon which every man is to examine himself are these:

1. Dost thou repair to the Sacrament with a competent measure of KNOWLEDGE?

2. Dost thou come with unfeigned REPENTANCE?

3. Dost thou come with a lively FAITH?

4. Dost thou come with LOVE undissembled, freely from thy heart to forgive all injuries committed against thee? Some, when they are to partake of the Sacrament, say to their wickedness or malice, as Abraham said to his two servants, Gen. xxii. 5. *Abide you here, and I will go yonder, and* WORSHIP, *and come again to you.*

We must, when we communicate, not only suspend the *act* of wickedness and malice, but depose the *habit.*"

T. FULLER.

SECT.

SECTION XXV.

The Necessity and Propriety of Preparation for the Sacrament; with a few Suggestions on the Means. "ΑΓΙΑ ΑΓΙΟΙΣ.

THE necessity of preparation for the Sacrament is evident from the nature of the case*, even if Scripture did not point it out, which is far from being true, in the opinion of the best, wisest, and most learned Divines that have adorned this country. "He that leads a good life," says Dr. Stanhope, "is never unprepared to receive the Sacrament." This is assented to; if by a GOOD life is meant a

* LAVABO, ut Rem divinam faciam. PLAUTUS.

"Φθεγξομαι εἰς θεμις εςι, θυρας δ' επιθεσθε βεβηλοις." ORPHEUS.

"Εκας, Εκας εςε βεβηλοι." CALLIM.

———"Procul, O procul este, profani
Conclamat vates." VIRG.

"Odi profanum vulgus et arceo." HOR.

CHRISTIAN life; a life of obedience to the precepts, and of faith in the doctrines of Christianity. But are not the best of Christians subject to lapses, from infirmity? Is not the weakness of human nature such as to require continual efforts to preserve it from degeneracy? Has not the experience of mankind evinced, that those who cease to be progressive in ascending the hill of Virtue, soon become retrograde?

The benefits sought in the Eucharist are GRACE, or the favour of God, and PARDON. These benefits, there is every reason to think, will not be bestowed on the impenitent; and it cannot be said of any man that he needs no repentance. The general habits of his life may be virtuous, yet, if he considers attentively his sins of *omission*, as well as commission, he will find that he has much to regret in the course of a conduct which, *comparatively* speaking, may be called good and exemplary.

But what shall we say of the *multitude* of all ranks constantly engaged in pleasurable pursuits, or in anxious, heart-corroding

roding quest of gain and advancement in life? Are they the persons, however *reputable* they may be, who, leading a good life, never can come unprepared to receive the Sacrament? Supposing them to preserve their integrity amidst conflicting passions and interests, and in the haunts of pleasure, where the sinews of virtue are always in danger of being relaxed, yet experience will justify the assertion, that they seldom have *time or inclination* to attend seriously to the duties and doctrines of the Christian religion. Are men, however good their credit in the world, to come with minds heated with worldly contests, with envy, with rivalry, with voluptuous affections, to the Altar? *Surely* before *such persons* venture to receive the Sacrament, preparation is absolutely necessary. The reason of the thing determines, that preparation is necessary for the majority of mankind, even if Scripture had been silent on the subject; and the most respectable Divines had left the point undecided.

Of the *propriety* of preparing for the reception of the Sacrament, none but men

men of perverse minds will entertain a doubt; though Divines of great character have imprudently denied its *necessity*.

The *first* time of receiving requires *peculiar* attention to the duty of preparation *. Care must be taken to understand the nature of the rite, to have a due sense of the benefits annexed to it, and a full conviction of its importance. And can a person who has never read or thought of the Sacrament, till the moment when it is to be administered, be supposed to possess this knowledge, and to have this sense? Is he not likely, if he come unprepared, to err either on the side of carelessness or of superstition? His life and con-

* The Jews were remarkably strict in their purifications, before they presumed to eat and drink, in the presence of the Holy One of Israel; and we have a Jewish prayer for *spiritual* purification.

Salvatorem nostrum suscepturi totis viribus debemus nos, cum ipsius adjutorio, præparare; et omnes animæ nostræ latebras diligenter suspicere, ne forte sit in nobis aliquod *peccatum absconditum*, quod et conscientiam nostram confundat et oculos divinæ majestatis offendat.

AMBROS. de Sacramentis.

In Sacrificiis ritè celebrandis majorem nullam ceremoniam fuisse videmus, quam NIHIL SIBI CONSCIRE, BONOS AC PIOS ESSE. GYRALD. Syntag. p. 17.

versation

versation may be good, and so far all is well; but he will require *knowledge* or *information* on the meaning and end of the Communion. The most adventurous among those who degrade the Sacrament, will not assert that instruction is improper, previous to the *first reception* of the Sacrament. Preparation of the *understanding* is *now* more than ever requisite; that the Communicant may be prevented from supposing that he is commemorating an historical event only, by a *positive* and insignificant rite, unattended with any appropriate advantage.

But after the *understanding* is prepared by a competent knowledge of the nature and end of the Sacrament; preparation of the *heart* will be proper, not only at the *first* time, but at *all* times of communion. A devout *frame*, or disposition of mind must be formed; a disposition suitable to all solemn occasions, and peculiarly suitable to an act of worship, extraordinary in its nature, and intended to produce effects still more extraordinary.

Prayer and reflection are evidently the proper modes of raising the devotional sentiments

sentiments to a due degree of height and ardour. "Happy is that soul," says Bishop Taylor, "which comes to these springs of salvation, as the hart to the water-brooks, panting and thirsting, longing and passionate, weary of sin and hating vanity, and reaching out the heart and hands to Christ."

The different modes of producing and increasing the happy dispositions which render the sacramental feast an object of desire and delight, must vary * according to the different attainments, ages, moral conduct, and other circumstances, of different persons. Books of devotion, such as "Companions to the Altar," and "Week's Preparations," may not be *necessary* to learned professors of divinity, or persons of good education and religious habits; but they may be very serviceable to the husbandman from his plough, the weaver from his loom, the mariner from

* Qui non meretur quotidiè accipere, non meretur post annum suscipere. AUGUST. on Matt. vi.

At (in vitando Sacramento) aiunt se Domino deferre *Reverentiam*. Quis est qui magis honorat; qui mandatis obtemperet, an qui resistat?

AMBROS. de Pæn. Lib. 1. cap. 1.

his

his cabin, the wife from her cradle, and for all the industrious tribe, who are making themselves useful to the community, while they are labouring for a morsel of food, and have little leisure, but on the Sabbath-day, for attending to the Bread of Life. The best advice that can be given to such persons is, that they apply to their Minister to point out the proper book for the occasion, and to give them the best instruction himself in private, as it is to be concluded he does in the pulpit. The superior orders will generally be well able to find out proper books for themselves, if they are *seriously* desirous of information *.

* Inter Catholicos non est annumerandus qui temporibus Pascha, Pentecostes, et Nativitatis Domini non communicaverit. Concil. Elib.

Βελτιστοι οι ανθρωποι προς τους Θεους βαδιζοντες.
PYTHAGORAS apud Plutarch. de Superstitione.

Justificatio et Sanctificatio sunt ACTUS QUIDEM PERPETUUS, in quo, et Deus *semper donat*, et Homo *semper recipit*. VOSSIUS de Sacr. Vi et Effic.

SECT.

SECTION XXVI.

The Obligation to Frequency of Communion considered.

WITH respect to frequency or infrequency of communion, the dictates of every man's conscience, supposing him well-disposed and competently informed, afford the best direction. "The law of the Church* must be his least measure; the custom of the parish, where he resides, his usual measure; the spirit of devotion his certain measure: but he who neglects it habitually does, by implication, say, that the Holy Sacrament is contemptible†."

The obligation to *frequency* of Communion will appear from a due consideration of the design and end of the insti-

* "It is to be feared that they who never receive but at EASTER, and never fast but in Lent, never repent till they die!" ROGERS.

"If thou foundest it a *Feast*, (that is, tookest delight in it,) God should hear *oftener* of thee." ROGERS.

† Bishop Taylor.

tution

tution. It is intended to procure an UNION *with the God of our Salvation*; and that union procures, a necessary, (consequent, or concomitant) effect; sanctification and pardon. We are baptised but once; but we are to communicate, without limitation to the number of times, while life continues."

"By Baptism we are united to the mystical body of Christ, which is, his Church; and since *Church-membership* is not only an outward, but a public rather than a private thing, *one single* administration of such rite is sufficient to make that union lasting*."

"But by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are united, as members, to the *spiritual* body of Christ, that is, his GRACE. This is an inward union, and lasts *no longer* than the right disposition of the heart and affections shall continue; and this, by reason of our *corrupt nature*, and perpetual *commerce* with an evil world, being *always impairing*, it has always occasion to be strengthened and renewed.

*Bishop Warburton.

This

This is the office of the Holy Spirit; whose gracious influence more peculiarly sanctifies that holy season, the season of communion. Hence the use and necessity of frequent communion, intimated in the words of the institution, "Do this in remembrance of me," which imply the CONTINUING TO RECEIVE HIS BENEFACTION, which is conveyed to us from time to time, and "as often as we shew forth "the Lord's death till he come." So true is the account given in this sacred rite in the articles of our Church: "That the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not only a badge or token of a Christian man's profession, but rather a certain and sure witness and effectual sign of GRACE, and God's good-will towards us; by which he doth work invisibly in us; and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him *."

This Sacrament being then a Sacrament of spiritual NUTRITION, is to be *repeated* so long as we continue in this sublunary state, and subject to spiritual infirmity,

* Article XXV.

disease

disease, and famine. In such a state, SPIRITUAL DEATH must be the consequence of refusing sustenance.

If indeed any man be confident that the grace which he received at his last celebration of the Eucharist is not impaired, and that he has not committed sin, since the forgiveness he then obtained, he may, perhaps, have reason to think the repetition of the Sacrament is to him not *absolutely* necessary. But who can possess such confidence without presumption? If we say that we have no sin, and feel no decay of grace, while we continue in a corrupt world, and carry in our bosoms a *natural* propensity to error and to vice, we probably deceive ourselves, or wish to deceive others by hypocrisy, "A man, one would think, cannot too often commemorate our Lord and his Passion, nor too often return him devout thanks and praises; nor too often repeat his resolutions of amendment; nor too often renew his solemn engagements; nor too often receive pardon of sins, and fresh succours of divine grace *."

* Waterland

But prudence and discretion have a proper place here, as well as in every thing in which human beings are concerned. We must be careful not so to familiarize the rite by frequency, as to lose all reverence for it by performing it unprepared, with minds engaged in the occupations of the world, and little attentive to the importance of the solemnity. "Divines of all ages of the Church, except in the first, and part of the second, century, seem inclined to abate of frequency rather than of the strictness of preparation or qualification *." The want of preparation is the only allowable impediment to frequency of communion; but this is an impediment which every man, unless under very peculiar circumstances, may himself remove.

Strictness of examination is required, yet this is not to be pleaded as an excuse, "either for a *total*, a *frequent*, or a *long* neglect of the Sacrament. A man may say that he comes not to the table because he is not prepared; and so far he assigns a good reason; but if he should be farther asked,

* Waterland.

why

why he is not prepared, he can only make some trifling, insufficient excuse, or remain speechless."

When we consider the frailty of man and the brevity of life, it must be deemed presumption ever to continue long unprepared for the Sacrament; because at the same time, we must be unprepared to die. If we keep our minds in a constant state of preparation, it will certainly be right to communicate, not only on all the great Festivals of the Church, but whenever opportunity offers, and at the same time no reasonable cause urges us to postpone it. Precise rules cannot be given; neither would they be followed.

One admonition, however, of universal importance, may be offered; which is, that though, with respect to frequency of communion, much is left to the discretion of the Church, and much to the private judgment of individual Christians; yet the omission must *never* be the effect of *contempt*, or even of *negligence**.

* "It is in this duty as in that of prayer, God has annexed blessings to it; but then he requires that we should be in a *proper frame* of mind to be PARTAKERS of them;

for we may ask and yet not receive; as may be the case when we come to the Communion-table from worldly views and for TEMPORAL advantage alone. As when any man receives the Sacrament MERELY to *qualify* himself for a PLACE. I say MERELY; for no doubt a man may receive with as much devotion when he has obtained a place, as at any other time. The law *supposes* (while it enjoins this as the best evidence a man can give of his hearty approbation of our happy constitution in Church and State), the law, I say, *supposes* that the person comes with *due dispositions*; otherwise by the *Rubrick*, which is part of the Law of the Land, the Curate is bound to repel him, as well as any other: and it is well worth observing, that though in the *Test act* there is a clause to *oblige* the Courts of Law to administer the oaths and receive the declaration, yet there is no clause to direct the clergy to administer the Sacrament to any person, though possessed of the highest post; so that this matter stands, without the least alteration, just as it did, before the act was made."

OCCASIONAL WRITER, No. 9. 1736.

SECTION XXVII.

Of administering the Sacrament to the Sick and Dying.

In one of those little cheap tracts so often alluded to, which are addressed to the unlearned, in order to disabuse them of their veneration for, and confidence in, the Eucharist, the *simple* person introduced by the Author to receive instruction asks this question among many others: "Are we authorised to consider the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as in any degree an appointed means for procuring the remission of our sins?—The answer is brief and peremptory:—"No;" and the questionist is authoritatively informed, (as we have seen in the preceding pages,) that, if ever the Sacrament is administered to the SICK AND DYING, as an appointed means of obtaining the re-

mission of sins, "the participant is deceived, and the rite misapplied."

That *present* remission of sins is annexed to the Sacrament worthily received has, I hope, been already proved. It is the doctrine of our own Church, and of every Church which has received the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. It was the doctrine of the primitive churches, even of the churches over which St. Paul presided; it is the express language of Scripture; St. Paul and his converts actually did obtain present pardon; it is implied in the notion of justification; it is supposed in the daily use of the Lord's Prayer; it is expressly the annexed benefit of *one* Sacrament, *thus* to *wash* for the *present* remission of sins; and therefore, if in the *other*, we drink *blood shed for the remission of sins*, we do in that also receive this same benefit *.

Taking it now therefore for proved and granted, that remission of sins is annexed to the Sacrament, I venture to affirm, that

* These points are proved to the satisfaction of candid minds in the Three Sermons on the Lord's Supper, preached by Bishop Cleaver at Oxford.

when

when it is administered in order to afford comfort and hope to the sick and dying, the PENITENT participants are *not* deceived, and the rite is applied with *peculiar* propriety. They want *spiritual*, as well as bodily comfort; and nothing, they themselves declare, can give it them, but the Sacrament. They trust in this holy rite, when they can trust in nothing else; and shall a *cavilling theologist*, in opposition to the Church, whose authority he has bound himself to obey, and in opposition to Scripture, on which the Church has founded its authority, refuse this last solace to the poor sufferer who implores it? Forbid it Christian charity and common humanity!

"But it is objected," says Bishop Cleaver, "that the Lord's Supper, *thus understood*, may, if administered on a death-bed, deceive the communicant, and encourage by-standers to *defer* their repentance, in hopes of cancelling all accounts of sin by one single act of devotion. It may be so; but this *abuse* is no way chargeable on the doctrine itself. If the sick be not really penitent, so far as

may appear to human judgment, they are to blame, who, in such circumstances, administer this Sacrament. If the case be doubtful, the propriety of it will be doubtful; or, if the communicant be in a *disposition* only to repent, the *delay* of this rite should be the measure first suggested, or, if in *extreme* cases it be administered, the hopes of pardon should be held out in proportion to the apparent penitence; and, in truth, where the feeble promise of amendment is offered only in circumstances which too probably may preclude the means of fulfilling that promise, the value of every religious pledge will be at best but suspicious: and it belongs to an omniscient Judge only to appreciate that, to which he alone can apportion the just degree of retribution. But these and many other cases of discretion must be settled by the doctrine itself well considered, *not the doctrine made to yield to the abuses*, which may occasionally creep into the practice of this or any other Church."

As this matter is of great importance and very delicate, I have thought it right to support my opinions by those of a learned

learned prelate, who appears to have studied the subject with much attention, and has written upon it with great ability.

But I have no reluctance in declaring it my full conviction, that when a poor dying mortal humbly and heartily desires to receive the Holy Sacrament, the Priest may administer it without scruple or *strictness* of examination, (which time and circumstances will hardly admit,) and if he is in error, he will be pardoned by the God of mercy. How must it aggravate the sufferings of a sick and dying man, stretched on the bed of pain, and distressed in mind, to be told, on his expressing his earnest desire of the Sacrament, and his sincere faith and repentance, that he is not fit for it, and that it cannot be administered to him! To the minister's discretion it must be left to converse with the sufferer in such manner and on such topics as circumstances may indicate and allow; and if, after all proper explanations, the sufferer *continues to desire the* Eucharist, I should think it a want of Christian charity to refuse it. A mistake of this kind, if it should be a mistake, committed

mitted through tenderness and compassion, though it may be severely censured at the tribunal of *human judgment*, will be viewed with indulgence at the throne of supreme wisdom and mercy.

Be it ever remembered, that in extreme cases, like that which I now suppose, "the hopes of pardon are to be held out in proportion to the apparent penitence;" so says the judicious prelate above cited; but he does not say, nor will any man of sound understanding and a feeling heart say, that in such extreme cases, the Sacrament is to be *refused* to the sick and dying, when they eagerly desire it. Far from the bed of affliction, sickness, and death, be such wretched comforters, such *severe* and *austere* priests, as, relying on their own SELF-CONCEIT, would deny the *last* consolation, when *earnestly* requested by an agonizing fellow-creature. The ERRORS of CHARITY, will, I hope and believe, be ever pardoned by the God of Love and Mercy.

SECTION XXVIII.

The small Number of Persons, comparatively speaking, who receive the Sacrament throughout a Country, like our own, professing Christianity.

If the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as the Church asserts, "be generally necessary to salvation," and many most important benefits, (as I hope has been proved,) be annexed to it, how greatly is it to be lamented, that few in comparison, ever think of receiving it. Select any great and populous parish in the kingdom, and you will perhaps find, that scarcely one in ten among the inhabitants, has done that which the Church declares "to be *generally* NECESSARY TO SALVATION *."

The

* "If there be a man who comes to qualify himself "for a place upon the TEST ACT, and who looks upon "the Church Service as an idle, insignificant parade, to him

The poor and laborious are certainly no less interested in communicating at the Altar Table than persons in the middle and higher classes; yet a very great majority of the poor and laborious are found to neglect it entirely, and to resign their breath without having once tasted what is called in Scripture, the BREAD OF LIFE, the Means of their Soul's Subsistence.

To a mind which duly reflects, this consideration cannot but be matter of charitable regret. It must operate in exciting the endeavours of all who have opportunities, to recommend the performance of this duty to every individual, from the Prince and the peer to the peasant and the beggar. The duty of receiving the Sacrament, and of preparing for it, should be the frequent subject of animated addresses from the pulpit; of affectionate instructions in the family, and of FRIENDLY CONVERSE in the cottage.

The old Canons of the Church are very strict in requiring a general attendance

"him God is no more present at the Communion Table "than at the Gaming Table."

TUCKER'S *Light of Nature.*

on

on this holy rite. They declare all persons who come to Church and join in the prayers, and yet turn their backs on the Eucharist, excommunicate. That such severity should be revived is not desirable. Many might be compelled by it to attend with minds unprepared, and in a state which might render them unworthy. Example and persuasion are the modes to be now adopted. Instruction in the nature, end, design, and benefits, must be first given with patient perseverance. Little tracts should be distributed; but caution should be used, lest those books, which, by *explaining away the mystery and benefits*, render the Sacrament a mere nullity, should insinuate themselves: and lest the imitators of Bishop Hoadly should find their way into the cottage, instead of Bishop Wilson. The pulpit is certainly the proper place for instructing the poor; but unfortunately the *very* poor, those who are *ashamed* of their ragged and squalid appearance, seldom enter the church. In many churches there is NO PLACE for them, yet of such was Lazarus and other *paupers* recorded in the Gospel, to whom the compassionate

passionate Jesus shewed particular attention. Tracts very short and very plain should be placed in their hands; and though many of them cannot read, yet they usually find somebody who can and will read to them, especially since the establishment of Sunday Schools. It is something to turn their minds to the subject. The poor are always pleased with the attention and solicitude of their superiors in their favour; and are often converted by this circumstance alone from the error of their ways, from drunkenness and idleness to industry and frugality. I know nothing more that can be done, except, indeed, the zeal of well-disposed persons should lead them to make friendly and *domiciliary* visits to the poor, in order to enlighten their minds in things which so much belong unto their peace. Such would be a god-like office; and they who undertake it must not be offended by the scoffs and ridicule of worldly-minded and infidel by-standers. I believe there are many among the *Sectaries*, who, animated with sincere piety, perform such offices as these, and are successful. No

liberal

liberal and truly Christian mind will despise men whatever opprobrious name their sect may bear, who do so much good, and, in consequence of it, suffer so much evil, as the contempt and reproach of their acquaintance. To go about doing good, and to be reviled and persecuted for it, we should remember, was the lot of him who was our GREAT EXEMPLAR.

But it must not be supposed that the neglect of the Sacrament is confined to the poor. The man of business, the man of pleasure, and the man of ambition, seem to take little notice of it; whether from thoughtlessness, from contempt, or from the multitude of their occupations, is not easy to determine. All that can be farther said to such persons is, that the churches are open, and they are invited to enter and receive instruction; that treaties are written and offered to their perusal; and that if they will not enter the one, nor read the other, on themselves only must fall the evil consequence. In the day of pain, sickness, or some other adversity, they may learn to feel their want of spiritual consolation. In the day of health

health and wealth they are too apt to be under the influence of PRIDE, intellectual as well as worldly pride, which renders the heart obdurate, and the ear deaf to religious admonition. But an hour will come when *Conscience* will sound an ALARM.

The persons above spoken of, whether rich or poor, are spoken of, as what they profess to be,—CHRISTIANS. Sceptics, infidels, and conceited superficial readers of French philosophy, the MODERN RATIONALISTS, are a numerous tribe, who, on *principle*, neglect the Eucharist. Argument has little effect on them, for they are *enthusiasts in their way*, enthusiasts in the school of sophistry. The school of adversity may, perhaps, afford them at some period of their lives a better lesson. The grace of God may find entrance into their hearts when softened by affliction. The Sacrament may then be sought with an avidity encreased by the remembrance of their present neglect.

However that may be, it is certain that *Christians* cannot live consistently with their profession, without participation of the Lord's Supper; and no less certain, that

that the greater number do not participate. This PHÆNOMENON IN THE RELIGIOUS WORLD, *will fully justify my humble attempt, and calls for the active exertions of all who wish to be faithful ministers of the Gospel.*

It may surely repress the mistaken zeal of the *professional* depreciators of the Sacrament when they see how few assemble at the Communion Table; few, in comparison with those who *never* approach it. If the benefits are little, or none, who will incur the danger? The danger, s it is for midably described, of receiving unworthily*? Even prudent and sober-minded men may, in their fears, be tempted to believe that

* On the subject of worthily receiving, I shall give some of the sentiments of an old and sensible Divine; modernizing his language, and illustrating his meaning with additional observations.

"Is any man," he asks, "so plentifully blessed with Grace that he can be said to partake the Holy Sacrament *worthily?*"

To which he answers: "One may perform an action worthily in a *threefold* respect: First, WORTHILY, DIGNITATE ÆQUALITATIS; as, the labourer is *worthy* of his

that it is better to abstain, where the benefit is represented by great theologians as doubtful, or rather none at all, while a *possibility* of incurring the greatest penalties

his hire: This is the *Worthiness of Equality*; because the performance and the payment preserve an equilibrium in the scales of justice. This Worthiness *claims* the reward due to it, and he who denies or detains the reward does the *worthy* party a wrong and injury. Now, *no man* can receive the Sacrament with this kind of worthiness. The Church itself, in her Liturgy, *disavows* all pretensions to this kind of Worthiness at the Communion. We are there first instructed to say, *We are not worthy so much as to gather the Crumbs under thy Table;* and to add afterwards, Though we be *unworthy* through our manifold sins to offer unto thee any Sacrifice.

Secondly: We may perform an action *worthily*, DIGNITATE CONVENIENTIÆ, APTITUDINIS or DECENTIÆ, in the worthiness of *congruity*, *aptitude*, or *decency*, which consists, though not in a perfect and exact proportion of the performance to the recompence, yet in *some* fitness, congruity, and resemblance to that which is required: as in Scripture, *Bring forth therefore fruits meet for* or *worthy of repentance*; that is, such as bear no repugnancy and contradiction to the repentance you profess, but are in some degree agreeable and suitable to it. So in the phrases, walk WORTHY *of the Lord*, WORTHY *of your calling*, *worthy* of the Gospel*, it is

* Col. i. 10. Ephes. iv. 1. 1 Phil. i. 27.

mean

ties is declared in the Communion Service. Ill-grounded TERROR on one side, and presumptuous CONTEMPT on the other, are causes of that neglect of the Sacrament which is every where visible.

Every

meant that your life should not disgrace your creed; nor your practice be inconsistent with your profession. And we cannot but believe that *Peccata surreptitia*, SINS OF INFIRMITY (not indeed from their exemption from wickedness, but from God's abundant mercy), *are compatible* with this kind of *worthiness*, the *worthiness of congruity*. In this acceptation of the word "WORTHILY," we may receive the Sacrament *worthily*; that is, so fitted and prepared, as that our state shall bear *some* resemblance or congruity to the solemn service of sacramental Communion.

The third kind of *Worthiness* is, DIGNITAS DIGNATIONIS; the *worthiness* of *acceptance*; that low degree of worthiness which God for Christ's sake, VOUCHSAFES (*dignatur*) to accept in mercy and in pity to our infirmities. That man is worthy who is accepted as *worthy*, by the CONDESCENSION of the Supreme Being, not *weighing* our merits, but dispensing with rigid justice, and supplying our defects by his forgiveness or indulgence. If *men* should deem that worthy which is not so, or shall prize a pebble as a pearl, the thing so falsely estimated acquires no *new* value by their *mistaken* appreciation, but if GOD VOUCHSAFE to esteem men *worthy*, then, as every thing is really such as it is accounted to

Every minister of a parish may assure himself, that an ADDITION TO THE NUMBER OF COMMUNICANTS, is one of the most certain proofs of an increase of piety among his parishioners, and of his success in the discharge of his ministerial office. When the religious principle is strong it will lead men to delight in the feast of piety and charity: but when such a banquet is offered in vain, it is an infallible indication of a lost or vitiated appetite.

The

be by the great Disposer of all things, *his* VALUATION gives a *worth* not inherent in them, but superadded and adscititious. "*I have blessed him*, (saith Isaac of Jacob) *yea and he shall be blessed* *. So God has accounted certain persons *worthy*; YEA AND THEY SHALL BE WORTHY: They *shall walk with me in white*, as we read in the Book of Revelations, for they are WORTHY †.

Let us then bring with us, when we come to the Sacrament, the WORTHINESS of *fitness* and *congruity* and God of his goodness will reward us, by voluntarily bestowing upon us the DIGNITAS DIGNATIONIS, the WORTHINESS of ACCEPTANCE;"—that is, he will *vouchsafe* to make us WORTHY, by overlooking or pardoning our *unworthiness*."

THOMAS FULLER.

* Gen. xxvii. 33. † Rev. iii. 4.

The papists were deemed highly culpable for denying the cup to the laity. May not those ministers incur similar blame, who, in this Protestant country, deny *both* the cup and the bread to their parishioners; which in *effect* they do, when, upon this subject, they neglect to inform ignorance, or to stimulate indifference? When they suffer whole Parishes, and very populous Parishes, to neglect the Lord's Supper, except, perhaps, in a FEW INSTANCES, at Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas? There is reason to believe that throughout a very great part of this extensive empire, professing Christianity, not one in a hundred ever communicates: and yet the Church teaches that the Sacrament is generally *necessary* to SALVATION. Whoever wishes to revive the religious principle, should bestow particular pains in recommending to the people of his Parish frequent Communion.

SECTION XXIX.

Of communicating internally, or spiritually, in private, *in certain Cases of* Necessity.

Circumstances may arise in which persons of great piety and devotion must wish to communicate with Christ, and their fellow-Christians; and yet be unavoidably prevented from doing it in the established manner, by the want of a church, a minister, the elements, or a convenient opportunity. Persons on their travels into foreign countries where a different persuasion prevails; in ships making long voyages; in prisons among enemies; in exile; in sudden sickness; in unforeseen accidents; in distress of mind requiring immediate relief, and at the approach of death, may desire the assistance of a pastor, and the sacramental ordinance of the Church, without the possibility of obtaining either in due time. Is there no way opened for these to procure satisfaction

satisfaction to their minds, if they are convinced that the participation of the Sacrament is necessary to their present peace and future welfare?

I venture to assure them, that in cases like these, and all others of *absolute necessity*, they may communicate SPIRITUALLY in solitude, with humble but reasonable confidence, that they shall derive the benefits of grace and pardon.

But because in cases of great importance my mind feels relieved by relying on the support and authority of others, I will quote the words of BISHOP TAYLOR on the subject:

"Such persons as these, if they duly *prepare* themselves, and earnestly desire that they *could actually* communicate, may place themselves upon their knees, and, building an altar in their heart, celebrate the death of Christ; and in holy desire, JOIN with all the congregations of the Christian world, who *that day* celebrate the Holy Communion; and they may serve (or promote) their devotion by the form of prayers and all *actions eucharistical*, changing only such circumstan-

tial words as relate to the *actual* participation.

"Concerning which I only add the pious advice of a religious person: Let every faithful soul be ready and desirous often to receive the holy Eucharist to the glory of God; but if he cannot so often communicate sacramentally as he desires, let him not be afflicted, but remain in perfect resignation to the will of God, and dispose himself to a spiritual Communion; for no man, and no thing, can hinder a well-disposed soul, but that by holy desires she may, if she please, communicate every day.

"To this nothing is to be added, but that this way is *never* to be used but upon NECESSITY; not upon *peevishness* and spiritual pride; not in the spirit of schism and fond opinions; not in despite of our brother, or contempt or condemnation of the holy congregations of the Lord; but with a living faith and an actual charity, and great humility, and with the spirit of devotion, and that so much the more intensely and fervently as the person (thus administering to himself) is really troubled for

for the want of *actual* participation in the communion of saints; and then that is true which St. Austin said, (*crede et manducâsti,*) "Believe, and thou hast eaten."

That the above doctrine is countenanced by our Church may be concluded from a liberal construction of the *Rubrick* affixed to the office for the Communion of the Sick in the Liturgy.

"If a man either by reason of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the *Sacrament* of Christ's body and blood, the curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he doth not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."

The

The excellent BISHOP WILSON has supplied a short *Form* of *Spiritual Communion*, as he terms it, in his very useful book on the Lord's Supper; a book which perhaps has done more good to society in promoting religion and virtue among the mass of the people, than the lucubrations of the most learned Theologians*.

* Persons engaged in the business of the WORLD, and of high rank and consequence in the WORLD, are often, from inattention, wonderfully IGNORANT of all that concerns Religion.

And here I may introduce a distinction of the schools between NESCIENTIA and IGNORANTIA.

The NESCIENTES are such as *know not* many things, which either they are not bound to know, or have not the means of knowing.

The IGNORANTES are those who *know not* what it is their duty to know, and what they have also the means of knowing.

In this sense of the word "IGNORANT," some of the most knowing and learned of the age are IGNORANT; that is, they are well acquainted with things which they are not bound in duty to know, but destitute of due information in things which they and every man is bound in duty to know; THE THINGS WHICH BELONG UNTO THEIR PEACE. In the language of the schools, they are not *nescient*, but they are IGNORANT.

Nescientia est simplex CARENTIA Scientiæ; Ignorantia est Nescientia corum quæ quis scire debet.

To increase their misfortune they are *ignorant* of their IGNORANCE. THOMAS AQUINAS.

SECT.

SECTION XXX.

The Spirit and Circumstances of the present Times render Zeal and Diligence in defending and diffusing the great and mysterious Doctrines of Christianity peculiarly expedient.

THAT these are not times for diminishing the force of religious principle among mankind, will be readily acknowledged by all who form a just estimate of them. The adversaries of the Church and its doctrines are numerous and indefatigable. They multiply their publications, and, as a Writer frequently quoted in this volume observes, characterize them "with a *profligate intrepidity of assertion*, which bears down the native diffidence of young minds, imposes upon their candour, and, precluding all suspicion of doubt, induces them to believe propositions which have neither truth nor the colour of truth."

"And

"And possibly," he proceeds, "it never was more expedient, or more necessary, I do not except any period of time in this kingdom, to inculcate, to explain, to enforce, the great truths of religion in public and in private, in season and out of season; to make them the topics of domestic intercourse, of academic instructions, the occupation of the pulpit, and *the ultimate scope of all our learned labours.* It is now again become eminently incumbent on those who believe the plain truths of the Gospel, to profess their belief, and of those who profess, to give a reason of their hope, as well as to manifest its existence by that *animated zeal* which is its genuine effect; returning again, as often as occasion shall make it necessary to the principles of the doctrine of Christ, and laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and faith towards God, lest under the present *security* of our Establishment, we suffer the HERESY OF SOME, whilst it flatters the broad INFIDELITY of others, to make gradual and individual depredations upon the subjects of our holy faith, more

more effectual and pernicious than the avowed exertions of united force."

When it is considered that various PAMPHLETS, read by many who scarcely read any thing else, have long been systematically employed in extolling every book and tract written against what is *contemptuously* termed ORTHODOXY; and in depreciating the most respectable works in support of the sublimest doctrines of Christianity, it will cease to excite wonder, that superficial minds have very generally caught the infection of scepticism * and

* The disputers of this world cannot see, (as they urge as an excuse for their scepticism), any virtue in Faith. They think that Faith is involuntary; and *necessarily* produced or prevented by the evidence of the fact, or the contrary. But religious Faith is a Faith (partly *sui generis*), of a particular nature, and differs greatly from mere historical Faith, or the assent of the mind inevitably consequent on demonstration. The will is much concerned in producing that Faith which the Gospel requires, and which is to be considered as a moral virtue, acceptable to Heaven, and required in a Christian Believer. On this subject I wish to submit the sentiments of Bishop Taylor to every reader, whose mind is not quite closed by Pride and Prejudice.

"In Faith there must be an act of the will as well as of

and heresy; and it will at the same time appear highly expedient, that the diligence

of the understanding, and as much Love, as of Reasoning or Discourse, (*Discursûs*, i. e. Argumentation).

"For he that only consents to an article, because it is *evident*, is indeed convinced; but has no excellency in his faith, but what is *natural*, nothing that is GRACIOUS and MORAL.

"True Christian Faith must have in it something of *obscurity*. Something must be *made up* by duty and by obedience. We must trust the evidence of God in the obscurity of the *thing*. The testimony of God must be clear, and the thing in all other senses, NOT clear; and then to trust (or have faith in) the article; because God hath said it, it must have in it an excellency which God loves and which he will reward. In order to this, it is highly considerable, that the greatest argument to prove our religion, is the GOODNESS and the HOLINESS of it. It is that which makes peace and friendship; content and consent, which unites all relations and endears the relatives. It relieves the needy and defends the widow. It ends strife and makes love endless. ALL other arguments can be opposed and attacked by Wit and Malice; but against the GOODNESS of religion no man can speak; by which it appears, that the greatest argument is that which moves love, intending or proceeding by Love to convince the understanding.

"And then with respect to those who can enquire *farther*; their enquiries also must be modest and humble, according to the nature of things and to the designs of God. They must not *disbelieve* an article of Christianity,

gence of every sincere believer should be exercised in the defence of opinions: the prevalence

anity, which is not proved like a *conclusion* in GEOMETRY. They must not be *witty* to object and *curious* to enquire beyond their limits. For some are so INGENIOUSLY MISERABLE, that they will never believe a proposition in Divinity, if *any thing* can be said against it. They will be *credulous* enough in *all* the affairs of their LIFE, but impenetrable by a Sermon or the Gospel. They will believe the word of a *man*, and *trust* to the promise of their neighbour, but a promise of Scripture signifies nothing, unless it can be proved like a proposition in *Mathematics*. If Sempronius tell them a story, it is sufficient if he be a just man and the narrative be probable; but though religion be taught by *many* excellent men, who gave their lives for a *testimony*, this shall not pass for truth, till there is *no* objection left to stand against it. The reason of these things is plain. THEY DO NOT LOVE THE THING. THEIR INTEREST IS AGAINST IT. THEY HAVE NO JOY IN RELIGION. They are not WILLING AND DESIROUS that the thing shall appear true. When love is the principle, the thing is easy to the understanding. The objections are nothing. The arguments are good. The Preachers are in the right.

"FAITH assents to the resolutions of the Gospel, not only because they are well-proved, but because they are excellent things; not only because my reason is convinced, but my reason yields upon the fairer terms, because MY AFFECTIONS ARE GAINED. For if faith were an assent to an article but just so far as it is DEMONSTRATED, then faith were *no virtue* and infidelity

no

prevalence of which he must think essential not only to his own, but to the happiness of the whole human race.

I dwell not on the ill effects of that spurious philosophy which has been imported from a neighbouring country, because they are obvious to every observer; but, I must remark, that their importation and disseminaton in England

no sin. In this there is no CHOICE and no REFUSAL. But where that which is probable, is also *naturally* INDEMONSTRABLE, and yet the conclusion is *that*, in which we must rejoice, and *that*, for which we must earnestly contend, and *that* in the Belief of which we serve God, and *that* for which we must be ready to die; *there* it is certain, that the *Understanding*, observing the *credibility*, and the WILL, being pleased with the *excellency*, they produce a ZEAL OF BELIEF; because they together, (the Will and the Understanding) make up a *demonstration*.

"For a reason can be opposed by a reason, and an argument by an argument; but if I LOVE MY RELIGION, nothing can take me from it, unless it can pretend to be more *useful* and *more amiable*, more *perfective*, and more excellent then Heaven and Immortality, a Kingdom and a Crown of Peace, and all the Glories of the Eternal God."

No man ever yet affectionately and earnestly desired to believe, but he did believe."

BP. TAYLOR.

have

have been greatly facilitated by the preparatory labours of many insidious enemies to Christianity at home.

Dr. Waterland, a man of singular erudition and sagacity, who greatly served the *cause* of Christianity and the Church of England, and, compared with whom, the opponents of his doctrine, in the present day, appear, very slenderly furnished with LEARNING, has asserted, "that, in general, all discussions which have for their object immediately to *lessen the dignity and importance* of the *Lord's Supper*, are in *reality* designed as so many attacks upon the DIVINITY of CHRIST."

This mode of attacking the divinity of Christ, is like the subterraneous operations of a mine in a siege. The destruction intended is not suspected, and therefore not repelled, or even resisted, till resistance is too late. The outworks must be preserved, if we would secure the citadel. The divinity of Christ is indeed a topic too large to be entered upon in this place; but, however a defender of it may be exposed to the heavy displeasure of

its opponents, I must bear my testimony, that whatever tends to invalidate that doctrine, contributes, at the same time, to the utter extermination of Christianity.

If according to Dr. Waterland, to lessen the dignity and importance of the Sacraments be to attack the Divinity of Christ; then, to support and enhance their dignity and importance, must conduce to the defence of that sublime and most momentous tenet. The true doctrine of the Sacraments is worthy of all possible reverence and esteem, for its own sake; but it is also highly worthy of zealous support as connected with the divinity of our Saviour: that doctrine, which gives a sanction to his precepts above all that can be pretended to, in the schools of antient Egypt, Rome, or Athens; where, nevertheless, admirable morality was delivered from the suggestions of unassisted reason.

They, therefore, who would preserve Christianity, in its full vigour and its highest purity, will be active in preserving among the congregation, over which they may preside, and in all situations,

situations in which they may have influence over numbers, the dignity and importance of the Sacraments, by explaining their nature, pointing out their *benefits*, and recommending a frequent COMMUNION. The Eucharist should ever be represented, not only as a *duty*, in which man alone is concerned, but as a *rite*, in the performance of which, God condescends to interpose, and by the agency of his Holy Spirit to participate. It is this which gives it a superiority above all other modes and expressions of faith and devotion practised in any age or in any region of the universe.

Throughout this treatise, and all other papers which I have ever written on the important doctrines of Divinity, I wish, from unaffected diffidence, to be supported by the opinion of great scholars and good men, who were, or are, the ornaments of their times. I hope to be sheltered under their wings from the shafts of angry heretics and sophists, which are often tipt with poison, though emitted from a feeble bow. The doctrine which I have just mentioned, that the Eucharist is a rite, in which God

bears a part, shall be brought forward under the protection of Waterland. He says: "In the first place let it be noted, that the Eucharist is not merely a *duty* of *ours*, but a sacred RITE, *in which God himself bears a part.*" The doctrine of our Church, and of all Christian Churches, early and late, is much the same with what our *Homilies* teach us; namely, that "in the Sacraments God embraces us, and offereth himself to be embraced by us." A learned writer observes, and proves, that a Sacrament relates to that which FLOWS FROM GOD TO US; and he adds, "that it is a thing neither denied nor forgotten by any, but is evident from what the Scriptures teach concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper *. Indeed the

* Towerson on the Sacraments, p. 12. Vossius, to the same purpose, says: "Quemadmodum FIDES est quasi MANUS NOSTRA, quâ nos quærimus et accipimus: sic verbum et SACRAMENTA sunt quasi MANUS DEI, quibus is nobis offert et confert, quod a fide nobis petitur et accipitur:"—*As faith is, as it were,* OUR HAND, *by which we seek and receive; so the Word and the Sacraments are, as it were, the* HAND OF GOD *by which he offers and confers upon us whatever is thus sought and received by faith.*

Socinian

Socinian scheme is, to exclude God, as it were, out of the Sacraments, and to allow him no part in them, but to reduce all to a bare human performance or positive duty ; BUT WE HAVE NOT SO LEARNED CHRIST.

In the case of one of the Sacraments, Baptism, what does the infant do ? a duty ? No ; a *rite* is performed upon the Infant by *man*, and grace to complete the Sacrament is bestowed by GOD. In the Eucharist, more indeed is done by the receiver ; but still God applies the benefit, and it is, by the gracious Ordinance of Heaven, a COMMUNION *.

* " Jamais l'Eglise de Dieu ne sera sanctifieè, ni jamais le Christianisme ne sera bien reformè, que par le bon Usage de la Communion. RAISONNONS TANT QU'IL NOUS PLAIRA ; il en faudra toujours revenir a ces adorables paroles du SAUVEUR ; si vous ne mangez la Chair du Fils de l'homme, vous n'aurez point la vie en vous : au contraire, si quelq'un mange de ce Pain, il vivra eternellement ; il vivra en ce monde par LA GRACE, et dans l'autre, par la GLOIRE."

BOURDALOUE.

SECTION XXXI.

Of the Church, as distinguished from the WORLD; *and the Expediency of preserving our union with the* CHURCH *by Sacramental Communion.*

IT seems probable that few, in comparison, have given themselves the trouble to form a true idea of the CATHOLIC CHURCH; though it is absolutely necessary, not only that its nature should be rightly understood, but that every man, who professes himself a Christian, should become an incorporated member of it. What is the CHURCH, is a question that many cannot answer

According to the plain deductions from Scripture, mankind are divided into *two* distinct tribes; those who belong to the kingdom of Christ, and those who belong to the WORLD. The kingdom of Christ is the Catholic Church; but here it must be

be observed, that the Church comprehends all true believers in Christ in every part of Christendom, laity as well as clergy, however distinguished by different names, or sub-divided into national or other less numerous sects or societies. It is the Catholic Church that is meant, when it is contradistinguished from the the *world*; it is that grand society of human beings which is united to Jesus Christ, as the limbs to the head of the body.

The word Ecclesia (the Greek for Church) originally signifies an EVOCATION, or a *calling out*. It imports therefore, that they who are in the Church are *called out* of a wicked and unbelieving world, and admitted into a society of which Jesus Christ is the head. The English word CHURCH (κυριακη, *Kyriace*, Kirk, or Church) signifies a house or society appropriated to the LORD (κυριω); a portion of mankind devoted to, and accepted by, the Author of our holy religion. It is obvious to all but the illiterate, that the word Church, when applied to a building, where a part of the people thus separated meet for the purposes of worship, is a popular

term, and has deviated like many other words from its original and proper signification; which is that of a society separated from a wicked *world*, and rescued from perdition.

All human beings must belong to one or other of these classes; they must be members of the *Church*, or of the *world*; the world, I mean, in a SCRIPTURAL sense. If they believe in Christianity, they must acknowledge the condition of those who are not of the Church, but of the world, to be truly deplorable. If a limb be cut off from a living body, it must die inevitably.

It should be the endeavour then of every serious man to make haste to escape from a situation, in which it is dangerous to continue; and to be *incorporated* with those who are in the way of peace and security. As Christ is the head of the Church, so an evil spirit is represented in Scripture to be the Prince of the World: the one is the Captain of Salvation; the other, often under the disguise of an angel of light, a Tempter to sin, misery, and everlasting perdition.

The

The sheep that are in the fold are under the protection of the good Shepherd; but those who stray, become the victims of famine, or the ravenous Wolf, "who "goeth about seeking whom he may "destroy."

This distinction between the CHURCH and the WORLD is of PRIME IMPORTANCE, and is truly Scriptural.

"I am well assured," says an ingenious Author of an Essay on the Church, "that if this subject of the Church, now so much neglected and almost forgotten, should come to be better considered; there would be more true piety and more peace, more of those virtues which will be required in Heaven, and which must therefore be first learned upon earth.

"Some think they can make their *own* Church, and so dispise the word of God, and fall into infidelity. Others think they can make their own Church, or even be a Church unto themselves; and so fall into the delusions of ENTHUSIASM, or the uncharitableness of SCHISM. But as there is nothing to enlighten the minds of men in the doctrines of salvation

tion but the word of God, so is there nothing that can unite their hearts and affections but the CHURCH OF GOD:—"Ye are one bread and one body," saith the Apostle; "one body by partaking of one bread, and that can only be in the same Communion.

"There are two societies of which we are members; of the WORLD, by our natural birth; of the CHURCH, by our spiritual birth in Baptism. When we are admitted into the Christian covenant, we *renounce* this world as a *wicked* world, and become members of the Church, which is called the Holy Church. Both these societies are *influential* on those who belong to them; the one corrupts, the other sanctifies: therefore, it is of the last importance to mankind to consider and understand the difference between them.

"The WORLD is composed of men lost by the Fall; disposed to all manner of evil; ignorant of the way of peace; at enmity with God, and with one another; delighting themselves in the pride of appearance and the vanity of distinction.

"The Scripture says, '*the whole world 'lieth in wickedness.*' What *human philosophy*

losophy says of this description we are not to regard: if it is the description which stands in the Holy Scriptures, we are not to consider what men may say of it.

"Such is the WORLD, and such are we all, so far as we are members of it: God, therefore, of his infinite mercy, takes us out of this wicked society, and translates us into another. He delivers us from the power of darkness, and translates us into the kingdom of his dear Son; and WITHOUT this *translation*, we are inevitably LOST.

"This society is a *body*, of which the HOLY SPIRIT IS THE LIFE; and this life being communicated to those who are taken into the Church, they are thereby made partakers of an holy life, which is elsewhere called, the Life of God; from which life *they* are alienated who are out of this society *."

* The nearest *approach* to PERFECTION of the SPIRITUAL BODY WHEREIN WE ARE TO RISE AGAIN, which any Man is capable of making, in his *present* situation, is the thing directly productive of Salvation."
TUCKER'S *Light of Nature.*

The

The existence of this society no *Christian* can consistently deny, who repeats with sincerity the Creed of the Apostles; for he says, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, and the holy Catholic Church;" and as it appears necessary to salvation, that every man should be a member of the Church; the only question of importance remaining is, how we shall *secure a continuance* in the Church, after being admitted into it *unconsciously* by Baptism in early infancy? The answer is, by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

"Within the *notion* of the Church are comprehended," says Bishop Pearson, "good and bad, being both *externally* called, and both professing the same faith. "For the kingdom of Heaven is like unto "a field, in which wheat and tares grow "together till the harvest;"—"like unto "a net that was cast into the sea and "gathered of every kind;"—"like unto "a floor in which is laid up both wheat "and chaff;"—"like unto a marriage-"feast, in which some have on the wed-"ding-garment, and some have not;"—

it

it is the ark of Noah in which were preserved beasts clean and unclean. This is that great house in which there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour. There are many called, of all which the Church consisteth; but there are few chosen, of those which are called, and thereby within the Church." If any are not chosen, or are rejected after they are chosen, it is from their voluntary apostasy, or revolt, their own obstinate return to the WORLD. It is a DESERTION.

Our first great business is to be among those who shall be chosen. The *breach* of the vow in Baptism may perhaps exclude us; and who has not been guilty of such an *infraction*? What remains then but the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which is peculiarly calculated to reunite us to the Head of the Church; and to all the members by Communion? It is not safe to neglect these offered means of preserving ourselves, during life, in the holy society, in the kingdom

dom of Heaven, of which Jesus Christ is the Lord or Govenor. We read, that the "Lord added to the Church daily such "as should be saved. There is no other "name given under Heaven among men "whereby they must be saved but the "name of Jesus Christ:" and the benefit of his name cannot be given but to those in his kingdom; that is, in his CHURCH. As none were saved in the deluge but such as were within the ark of Noah, "so none," says Bishop Pearson, "shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, which belong not to the Church of God. This is the congregation of those persons here on earth, who shall hereafter meet in Heaven." They are the *Ecclesia*, the *Evocation*.

The Communion of Saints, which in the Creed we profess to believe, and so often and solemnly repeat; or the Communion of good men, accepted members of the Church of Christ, is best promoted by *Eucharistical Communion*, or the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In that holy rite, we have a mystical union with Christ; "and,"

as

as the same great prelate observes, "the spiritual conjunction of the members to the Head is the true foundation of the Communion which one member hath with another; all the members living and increasing by the same influence which they receive from him."

In the transcendent polity of the *kingdom* of Christ, the Sacrament forms not only the bond of allegiance to the King; but of love, amity, and confederation among all the SUBJECTS, thus united in peace with each other, as well as in obedience to their Prince, by the law of Christian love.

"If we walk in the light, as God is in "the light, we have fellowship one with "another *." When Christ sent St. Paul to the Gentiles, it was "to open their "eyes and to turn them from darkness to "light, and from the power of Satan unto "God, that they might receive forgive-"ness of sins, and an inheritance among "them which are sanctified by faith that "is in Christ †." Those who are *not*

* 1 John, i. 6, 7. † Acts, xxvi. 18.

of

of the Catholic Church of Christ are STILL GENTILES, though called Christians and living in a Christian country: St. Paul, by his preaching, has not opened their eyes; they are not "turned from darkness to light, nor from "the power of Satan unto God." Consequently they have *not* received forgiveness of sins; but have voluntarily renounced the inheritance which they might have possessed, had they become or continued adopted children of Christ by union and Communion.

Nothing that is here said on the Church can give just cause of offence to Dissenters of any denomination; for I mean by the Church, as I have already said, the *Catholic Church*, that comprehensive society, which takes within its pale ALL who sincerely believe in Christ, whatever be their form of worship, or their mode of government, and ecclesiastical discipline. By the WORLD, in its scriptural sense, I by no means understand the sects which, believing in Christ, differ from a National Church; but the professed *men of the world*, as they are called, who give themselves no concern at all about either the Church

Church or the religion of Christ; and who are, in truth, *unbelievers*, practical and theoretical, in the midst of all the means of instruction and grace. Many of the Dissenters from the Church of England, Papists, Presbyterians, Quakers, (whatever other denomination they may have chosen) have at all times displayed examples of faith, charity, and every Christian virtue. Such men are without controversy members of the CATHOLIC CHURCH, though they may enjoy no secular splendor, power, or prosperity. I wish them to become Members of our own most excellent Church; but I cannot pronounce them to be excluded from the Church of Christ, because they are out of our OWN; and who art thou, O Man, who shall presume to exclude thy fellow creature from the Mercy of thine and his almighty Maker:

I have only to add, that when they *worthily* communicate at the Eucharist, however their mode of administering may differ, as to the external ceremony, they are yet united to the body of Christ by faith and love. The QUAKERS, indeed, who administer not the Sacrament at all, are, I

conceive, under a great error; yet as their worship is spiritual, and their dispositions, evinced by their ACTIONS, remarkably charitable, I am willing to believe that they hold communion with all other sincere Christians, by a mental or cordial communion, and so are not separated from the Catholic Church. I wish any thing I could say, (though I wish without hope,) could prevail with them to take "the outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace." I lament what appears to me to be their mistake; but, far be it from any Christian, to say, that they are cut off by it from the body of Christ, while they exhibit proofs in other respects of a Christian faith and a Christian life.

Let us all, who name the name of Christ, "keep the UNITY OF THE SPIRIT in the "bond of peace;" and remember, that God is the Father of us all, and will pity his own children, though narrow and SEVERE THEOLOGISTS, from the *schools*, should pronounce their condemnation.

SECTION XXXII.

The Idea erroneous, that the Maintenance of the Dignity of the Catholic Church and the Rites of Christianity is unfavourable to civil Liberty.

GOOD order, subordination, tranquillity, justice, and mercy, are the legitimate and lovely children of true Religion. It is a most unfortunate mistake, and a most unjust calumny, to think and affirm, that the Catholic Church of Christ is hostile to the common rights of Man in civil Society.

Has any system of polity ever existed in the world which honoured the poorest and lowest ranks of men as they are honoured by the Christian Religion? In the Kingdom of Christ, which is the Church, MAN IS RESPECTED AS MAN, exclusively of all regard to the external circumstances of riches, honours, or station. All human beings in it are considered as one

family, the offspring of one parent, and all cherished with maternal affection. The nursing-mother seems to say to the world, in the pathetic language and beautiful imagery of our Saviour, "How often "would I have gathered my children to-"gether, even as a hen gathereth her "chickens under her wings; and ye "would not."

I should *love* the religion of Christ even as a heathen philosopher and philanthropist, for its beneficent effects on the human race. It is the guide of youth, the support of age, the repose of the weary, the refuge of the miserable. It arrests the hand of the oppressor, by appalling his conscience; or, if haply the oppressor should proceed and prevail, it teaches the oppressed to look with confidence to a DELIVERER, *mighty to save*.

Rome was free; yet slavery was permitted there, and slaves treated with singular inhumanity. We read in history, that when sick, they were often turned out of doors to take their chance, or sent in mockery to an island in the Tiber, to be cured by the god, Æsculapius. By the Roman

man laws a slave could not give evidence without the torture; and if a master were killed in his own house, all the slaves, however numerous, were put to death, though their innocence were manifest. But the Christian Emperors made laws in favour of this unfortunate set of men, and their chains were at length broken asunder by the prevalence of Christianity.

Slavery might, perhaps, be revived in Europe, if it were compatible with this philanthropic religion. There are persons living without religious restraint, who seem, from the unfeeling insolence of their behaviour to their inferiors, sufficiently willing that hereditary slavery should be again established. But Christianity has banished it, and nothing but a return to barbarous ignorance, and a total apostasy from CHRIST can ever restore it.

Before the introduction of Christianity, infants were often exposed to destruction by their libertine parents, as soon as born, and the practice scarcely deemed infamous; men were *compelled* to fight with wild beasts, and to murder each other for the entertainment of a theatre; and the

amusement was not condemned as cruel or tyrannical, till Constantine, in consequence of his adoption of Christianity, restrained it by law; and Honorius afterwards abolished it. Punishments were severe beyond description, and prisoners were treated with wanton rigor; but Constantine abolished crucifixion, and ordered that prisoners should be tenderly used and conveniently accommodated with habitation. Hospitals and eleemosynary institutions for the poor were scarcely known before Christianity appeared: and now, if we look round a Christian metropolis, we shall find some of the largest and most sumptuous buildings entirely constructed and accommodated to the relief of every kind of distress and disease.

Are not these ample testimonies that Christianity is favourable to the MASS of the people, if considered merely as members of an *earthly* society? Can it be adverse to the *rights*, when it so studiously consults the *ease* and *happiness*, of men, not of the rich and great only, but of the meanest mortal honoured with the human form?

The

The horrors of war have been in some degree mitigated by the spirit of Christianity. Rigorous and cruel as it still continues, it is a little softened by the respect which Christianity has taught even the *soldier in the ranks* to pay to MAN AS MAN. This mitigation is not to be attributed to the polished manners which prevail in the enlightened nations of Europe, for it is impossible not to observe that a nation which claims the distinction of a *superior* polish, has been more *cruel than ever*, since it began to slight Christianity. The polish of the World is often but a *varnish*, and where pride and property are concerned, feels little sympathetic tenderness for the rights of humanity. But the Christian religion humbles pride and controls avarice, by shewing the littleness of all earthly grandeur, the comparative worthlessness of all riches, and by founding the true dignity of human nature on the gifts of divine grace.

The dignity of human nature is best promoted and preserved by the religion which teaches that God vouchsafes to communicate his own Spirit to man; and

in proportion as man learns to value himself, with a rational esteem for benefits conferred on him by his Creator, he will be the more reluctant to submit to such degradation as vilifies his very essence. On the other hand, the rulers of the world, controlled by the spirit of the religion which prevails, learn to consider inferiors as at less distance from them, to honour all men as men, and to be less inclined to treat the very lowest of the species with indignity or injustice.

That the Christian religion may be abused, by the aspirants at despotism, to the purposes of depressing the people, must be confessed; because history proves that it has been so abused. But the religion so abused, is the Christian religion, in *name* only; its nature and spirit are most favourable to liberty and all the rights of man in a well regulated community.

"Religion," says the late Dr. Rotheram, "being of a peaceful and spiritual nature, has in itself no power but that which belongs to the MIND, and seeks to extend its dominion by no other means but those of conviction and the influence of motives

motives suited to the freedom of the mind. To become a subject of this power, *the mind must be free*, master of itself and its own determinations; FOR INTO THE KINGDOM OF RELIGION NO SLAVE CAN ENTER. All violence and *compulsion* therefore are utterly unknown to religion, the use of which is so far from serving its interests, that it *directly and fundamentally* overthrows them."

I have thought it proper to make these few observations, because some of the great sticklers for liberty, in recent times, have rashly dared to attack the Church and the whole system of Christianity with unexampled virulence, as if they thought it stood in their way, an obstacle to the reform of abuses, and the abolition of absolute power; whereas no philosophy, no religion, no code of laws, no form of government in the world has tended so much to establish the rational equality of men as Christianity.

The principal rite of Christianity, the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, contributes more than any thing else in this religion, to cause mankind to consider each

each other as brothers, entitled to an *equality of comforts* in this world, as far as justice and the known will of God will permit; for in this Holy Sacrament, we become all *united* by the Holy Spirit without respect to external and secular distinctions. We become by it *one body*, whether rich or poor, weak or strong, high or low; and it is impossible that they who have *worthily communicated* at the altar should retain a wish to oppress or injure a fellow Christian in any rank of life. The state and frame of their minds must lead them by choice to increase human happiness, and diminish human misery, wherever and whenever they can exercise any power. To hurt others, they must know, would be to injure their own souls, and to forfeit their PARDON and their GRACE.

The Gospel is indeed the true MAGNA CHARTA of human nature.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE thus attempted to vindicate the Eucharist from the contempt and neglect into which it appears to have fallen among many, from a thoughtless profaneness; from a rustic stupidity; from a barbarous and Heathenish habit of irreligion, contracted by immersion in sensuality and worldly cares; from a false philosophy, and from an erroneous theology. In this endeavour I have sought the support of Scripture; of the best divines of various ages, and of the opinions and practices of high antiquity. If I have erred, I have erred with a majority of the learned and the good; and my error, I think, cannot be injurious to the cause of religion and virtue.

It is better, as Dr. Waterland observes, to err on that side which ascribes too much to the Sacrament, than on that which

which ascribes too little; because it is erring on the SIDE OF THE PRECEPTS; for Holy Scripture gives express, and very alarming, cautions against paying too little regard to this holy institution, but none at all, against the contrary extreme. The error, if it be one, is also on the side of humility, modesty, and piety. Supposing us to be deceived, all that follows is, that we may be led to frequent the Sacrament oftener than we should otherwise do; to come to it with greater reverence, and to repeat our solemn vows for the leading of a good life by the assistance of divine grace, with more serious and devout affections.

No divines that I know of, teach that the use of the OUTWARD SACRAMENT IS OF ANY AVAIL, *without* inward FAITH and REPENTANCE, or entire OBEDIENCE. The reception of the Sacrament is not a SINGLE DUTY, but involves a SYSTEM of duties moral and religious. The outward part is the *least* and the *lowest* part; and, separate from a GOOD HEART, from Faith and Repentance, it is NO DUTY AT ALL. Such are the sentiments of the most judicious

and

and pious Divines of this country, and I adopt them cordially; but I will cite the words of Dr. Waterland in the following paragraph, as they are quite applicable to my humble essay.

"What I have endeavoured has been to maintain the dignity of a venerable Sacrament, by the light of reason, Scripture and antiquity, against unreasonable attempts to depreciate or undervalue it. The common methods of subversion begin with lessening the work of *preparation*, and then go on to sink the BENEFITS: the next step in the progress, is to reduce the whole to a bare *memorial*, a memorial of an absent friend, a master, or CHIEF MARTYR; passing over the DIVINE perfections of our Lord, and the ALL-SUFFICIENT MERITS of what he has done and suffered for us. Now, in order to build up again as others pull down, the business of these papers has been to shew, that the Sacramental memorial is a memorial of Christ, GOD AND MAN, who died a willing sacrifice for the sins of mankind; and that it is not a bare memorial or representation of something ONCE done and suffered, but a real

a real and present EXHIBITION of those graces, comforts, or blessings accruing therefrom to every WORTHY RECEIVER; that therefore proper acknowledgments and engagements are expedient from us, and these require suitable preparations and qualifications, and a deportment thereto corresponding: in a word, SELF-EXAMINATION, and SELF-APPROBATION *before-hand;* serious resolutions of AMENDMENT *at the time*, and a conscientious care *afterwards* to persevere in well-doing to our lives end." Such is the scope, and such the substance of my little Treatise, which I trust, human errors excepted, is entirely conformable to the true Scriptural and Church Doctrine.

Since the Eucharist is thus beneficial, and besides its mysterious effect in drawing down grace and pardon, conduces in a high degree to promote virtue, and render the conduct of life prudent, sedate, innocent, and useful, I cannot doubt but an attempt to revive a due degree of attention to it, is to serve society, especially in times so singularly unfavourable to religion as our own. It is not the querulous

querulous language of common-place declamation to assert, that the present times are singularly unfavourable to the prevalence of the Christian religion. I dwell no longer on the attempts of Churchmen in England to desecrate or unhallow the Sacrament; (*tell it not at Paris; publish it not in the streets of* RACOVIA;) but I say, that the manners and principles of the present times are unpropitious, not only to the due performance of sacramental rites, but to all the duties of Christian devotion, and therefore render the attempts of the humblest Theologian to revive the Religious Principle, desirable, and, whatever be their defects, VENIAL.

As to the manners of the times, it is certain that commerce, amidst its many advantages, has introduced a general spirit of selfishness and avarice; so that the devotional regard, which, in days of comparative poverty and virtuous simplicity, religion was wont to excite, is now paid to MONEY; that idol of the heart, on whose altar, truth, virtue, freedom, are daily sacrificed, with all the enthusiasm of the blindest bigotry. Self-aggrandizement, and

and worldly affluence and honours, become the CHIEF GOOD when religion is lightly esteemed; and those who seek it not, or relinquish it for the "things which "are not seen," are accounted in the *world's estimate*, fools or insane.

As to principles, the heart of man, be it remembered, can scarcely admit of TWO very *strong attachments* at the same time. When the world has seized the affections, the unseen Deity, and all the duties which result from an acknowledged relation to him, will be viewed both in the busy and gay world with indifference, and more than indifference, even with disgust; because they will often appear repugnant to the favourite pursuits of sordid interest and sensual pleasure. In this state of the public mind, the voice of Infidelity will be heard with eagerness, while religious discourses and addresses will be treated with neglect, if they should escape scorn. The affairs of the world, the great prizes which glitter in the eyes of pride, avarice, and selfish pleasure, will alone be considered as worthy the anxious care, and ardent pursuit of a man

man of sense. Numbers defend and keep each other in countenance.

But it may be worth while to reflect a moment how nearly such a state approaches to ATHEISM. The name shocks us, and is abhorred; but the reality is insensibly cherished by all who pay no worship to the Deity, though they profess to believe in one. The reluctance which men feel to admit the appellation of Atheist is, however, a proof that there are seeds of religious sentiments still remaining in them, which might be fostered by care, till in time, they might vegetate and bear fruit in abundance. Without care, they may perish, and the mind become a barren, dreary, dismal waste, uncheared by the sunshine of Hope.

If religion comprehend the worship and obedience due from men to God, and all the duties which they are bound to perform, either with the prospect of obtaining his favour, or the fear of incurring his displeasure; then, they who do not worship God; they who do not obey him; they who do not act with the hope of his favour, or the apprehension of his

pleasure, whatever their professions may be, or whatever name they may bear, are without religion, and consequently in practice, if not in theory, Atheists. The difference between practical and speculative Atheism is in *effect* small; they are both productive of wickedness, and terminate in misery. A man of this character must consider HIMSELF as the SUPREME and unaccountable JUDGE of his own conduct, and as the sole arbiter of his own happiness. His selfishness will, perhaps, lead him to avoid the infringement of *human* laws: but where criminal indulgence or villainous practices, conducive to worldly interest, are compatible with secresy and safety, what shall restrain him from the violation of the *divine* laws? what shall preserve him from internal guilt, the POLLUTION OF THE MIND? from pride, envy, malevolence, which, like weeds, take root and spring up in the bosoms of all human beings uncultivated and uncleansed by divine grace?

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is one of the most effectual means of grace. The preparation for it, and all that

that concerns the reception of it, is highly favourable to virtue; and whatever favours virtue must promote happiness, both private and social. But the man whom I have just described, however decent his external appearance and character, can never, while he continues to be comprehended under that description, avail himself of these means of grace and these supports of virtue.

In the Gospel we read, that none were to go to the marriage-feast without a wedding-garment; that is, a disposition suitable to the solemnity:—"Put on "Christ; put on the new man." This certainly is not to be done but by the assistance of the Holy Spirit; but how can he obtain the assistance of the Holy Spirit who never asks it in prayer? In order to put on this holy vestment, a worldly dress must be first put off and laid aside.

How far are they from a state of mind proper for communion with God and man in holy love, whose hearts are engrossed with the love of this world, and inflamed with a spirit of rivalry, envy.

wrath, contention! Let us view men in the busy haunts of avarice; let us mark them at the gaming-table; let us observe them unceasing attendants at every place of promised pleasure or vain ostentation. How alien seem their behaviour, their conversation, their hopes, and fears, and wishes from the pure and benevolent spirit of Christianity! Self admirers, and claiming admiration from all around them; proud, so as scarcely to look upon those, who are out of the pale of fashion and grandeur, as fellow-creatures; irritable and angry to such a degree as to be ready to strike and *take away life* for a *look*, much more a *word*, of offence; hating and hateful; or, if there be the semblance of love among them, it is often but the love of interest, or a grosser passion partaking of the brutal, though varnished with the affected refinements of a false delicacy. Selfishness prevails even in the love which appears real; for the lover often relinquishes the object and cares not what dire ill may await her, after the gratification of an appetite: a scene in human affairs which evil spirits might delight in; but which must

must be incompatible with that religion which teaches, "WHATSOEVER THINGS "ARE TRUE, WHATSOEVER THINGS ARE "HONEST, WHATSOEVER THINGS ARE "JUST, WHATSOEVER THINGS ARE PURE, "WHATSOEVER THINGS ARE LOVELY, "WHATSOEVER THINGS ARE OF GOOD "REPORT *". THESE THINGS our religion teaches and requires in all who profess it, as they tender their temporal and eternal felicity. To these things the sacrament of the LORD'S SUPPER is directly conducive.

Let it be duly noticed and remembered, by those who think outward *conformity* and *decorum* sufficient, that mere ADHERENCE to Christianity cannot constitute a Christian. Motives of sordid selfishness and mean policy may cause such an ADHERENCE; and render it often a *zealous* adherence always a *decent* adherence; but these are motives uncongenial in their nature to the *spirituality* of the

* Philipp. iv. 8.

Christian religion. To produce the amiable qualities, described in the passage just now quoted from the Apostle, there is a necessity for FAITH and GRACE. Fair appearances may exist without either of these; as flowers and fruits may be hung in wreaths round a dead or withered pole, severed from the Tree; but a ROOT is necessary to cause the growth of flowers, and the maturity of fruitage.

That *root* must be GOODNESS; and goodness springs inevitably from *grace*, though not from *nature*: for the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Goodness, as it is the Spirit of God; and the Holy Spirit is given most abundantly in the Sacrament by him who said, "I am that Bread of Life; I am "the Living Bread which came down "from Heaven: if any man eat of this "bread, he shall live for ever; and the "bread that I will give is my flesh, which "I will give for the life of the world. He "that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my "blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*."

Christ promised that he would be al-

* John, vi.

ways

ways *with us* even to the end of the world. He is with us at this day, by the influence of the Holy Spirit; and by his own appointment, that GIFT is more freely bestowed in the Sacrament, which he has rendered necessary by saying, "Except "ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and "drink his blood, ye have no life in you." "In the blessed Sacrament," says Bishop Taylor, "we receive him who is life and light, the fountain of grace, the sanctifier of our secular comfort, and the author of holiness and glory. But as it was at first, so it has continued; Christ came into the world, and the world knew him not; so *Christ has remained in the world* by the communication of *this Sacrament*, and yet he is not RIGHTLY UNDERSTOOD, nor TRULY VALUED."

Nevertheless it is this PARTICLE OF DIVINITY, vouchsafed to us at the altar which is "the pearl of great price;" the great treasure of the Gospel; the distinguishing glory and benefit of the Christian religion.

As, from the simple principle of *gravitation*, conceded to Sir Isaac Newton, he was enabled to account for all the phæ-

nomena

nomena of Nature; so by the doctrine of the Spirit's operation, from the Ascension to this hour, all the apparent difficulties of the Christian revelation are easily and satisfactorily explained. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God; and can any mortal presume to set bounds to its power, or account for all the modes or effects of its operation? However marvellous the dispensations of the Gospel, yet when we believe that it is God's Spirit which produces them, we cease to doubt and to murmur.

It is clear from Scripture, that the gift of the Spirit is designed to correct the evil tendency of the human heart, in its fallen and unregenerate state, and to produce GOODNESS, the prime and loveliest attribute of the Supreme Being. "The fruit "of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-"suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, "meekness, temperance."

It is neither genius, nor sagacity, nor learning, nor riches, nor power that constitute the most valuable ornament and possession of man, but it is GOODNESS;—a benevolent disposition, and a beneficent conduct

conduct and behaviour. GOODNESS is of a healing, fostering, conciliating quality, which converts every thing into happiness, as far as its power and influence extend; and it is in the mean time happy in itself, happy in its gentle and benign sensations, happy in the contemplation of goodness and of happiness diffused, increased, sublimed, prolonged. It is the PERFECTION OF MAN and causes him to approach to the divine nature.

If we consider man *without* goodness, how detestable and wretched an animal do we behold him! All his superior sagacity tends only to increase his wickedness and misery. He becomes an evil spirit, and we may be tempted to exclaim in the words of Scripture, "why died he "not from the womb?" Pride! Malice! Envy! Revenge! what tormentors are ye of the human bosom in its natural, in its depraved, in its unregenerate state! What havoc do ye make in a world which God originally pronounced good! and among creatures whom God, both in the Creation and Redemption, designed to be happy! The Christian religion

ligion aims at meliorating the wild stock of human nature. It teaches the thorn to bear grapes and the thistle figs .It purifies the fountain of human actions, the heart itself; and the fountain once clear, all the streams, in all their meanders, flow through the mazes of human life, comparatively with little pollution ; and even that little may, from time to time, be removed by those merciful ordinances which are designed to cleanse and purify the heart by the operation of divine grace.

The Eucharist is one and the principal of those ordinances. It is an ordinance peculiary adapted to the infirmity of human nature; for it is adapted to repair, while life remains, the decays of grace. The nature and efficacy of it I have attempted to explain, and have been guided by the Scriptures, and supported by human authority. After all, many will think differently from me on the subject; but while all who call themselves Christians agree in paying due honour to the institution, however they may understand it, let difference of opinion cause no violation of charity.

charity. "Of several persons," says Bishop Taylor, "beholders of a dove walking in the sun, as they stand in several aspects and distances, some see it of a red, and others of a clear purple, while others perceive nothing but green, yet all allow and love the beauties of the bird; so do the several forms of Christians, according as they may have been instructed by their first teachers or their own experience, conducted by their fancy and peculiar principles look upon this glorious mystery, the Sacrament; yet all affirm SOME GREAT THING or other of it, and by their difference confess the immensity and the glory."

To this I add an opinion of a most ingenious and learned modern divine, the Norrisian Professor in Cambridge. "One man," says he, "thinks that eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood means only a commemoration of his death; another thinks it is emblematically accepting the benefits of Christ's sacrifice; a third thinks it is eating, in some inexplicable way, the substance of Christ's body into which the bread has been changed; a fourth, that it

is

is eating the substance of Christ's body along with the sacramental bread: still, therefore, I say, which ever of these is right, or if none of them be right, the WORTHY COMMUNICANT does that which is really meant in Scripture by eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, and he gains all the benefit which God intended should arise from such eating and drinking; he does that which God hath commanded, and he obtains that which God hath promised."

Let it therefore be our chief care to become WORTHY COMMUNICANTS, and then, whether kneeling or sitting, whether we coincide exactly in our opinions or not, if we coincide in faith and charity, there is every reason to believe that we shall obtain pardon and sanctification. "The tree of knowledge," says Bishop Taylor, "became a tree of death to us, and the tree of life is now become an apple of contention. The holy symbols of the Eucharist were intended to be a *contesseration* and an union of Christian societies with God and with one another; and the *evil taking* of it disunites us from God, and the

the *evil understanding* of it divides us from each other." These sad effects will be avoided if we be duly careful to communicate with true faith and perfect charity, seeking THE TRUTH INDEED ALWAYS BUT SEEKING IT IN LOVE.

"We are all alike in search of truth" says the late learned Dr. Rotheram; "let us therefore proceed amicably and charitably in the way: abstaining from all mutual violence, and from all vain and unbecoming confidence in ourselves, which is generally the ground of it, remembering that all are EQUALLY FREE, and all EQUALLY INTERESTED in the great and momentous pursuit; in the course of which, though all may not tread exactly in the *same* steps, though all may not be happy enough to discover and constantly pursue the most *direct* path; nay, though all may make frequent deviations from it, yet hoping that we are in the main tending the right way, and that we shall all meet in the end.

"It is far above our power to bring all to embrace the same opinions; but one thing is in our power—to think charitably of

of each other; and to this we shall naturally be inclined, if we have those modest and humble sentiments of ourselves with which Christianity will inspire us. Were we all influenced by this spirit, we should then differ in opinion without being divided in affection."

Perfect unanimity, in the present state, is scarcely to be expected. Mutual concession should be made, among the professors of Christianity, wherever concession is consistent with the preservation of essentials. The Eucharist is an essential; because to it are annexed the present benefits of GRACE and PARDON. It cannot be dispensed with; it must not be dishonoured. It is one grand mean of diminishing wickedness; and let all good men, however divided in modes of worship, UNITE in proclaiming to the world, THAT WICKEDNESS IS THE DISGRACE AND MISERY OF MAN; AND RELIGION HIS PERFECTION AND GLORY.

FINIS.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX.

No I.

The Institution of this Sacrament by Christ as recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul.

MATT. xxvi. MARK, xiv. LUKE, xxii. 1 COR. xi.

THE night in which the Lord Jesus was betrayed, as they were eating, or did eat, Jesus took bread, and giving thanks, blessed it, and brake it, and gave it unto his disciples, and said, "Take, eat, this is "my body, which is given and broken for "you: Do this in remembrance of me." After supper likewise, having taken the cup, and given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, "Drink ye all of this, for this cup "is my blood of the new covenant, the "new covenant in my blood, which is "shed

" shed for you, for many, for the remis-
" sion of sins: This do ye, as oft as ye
" drink it, in remembrance of me (and
" they all drank of it): Verily, I say unto
" you, I will drink no more of this fruit
" of the vine until that day when I shall
" drink it new with you in the kingdom
" of my Father, in the kingdom of God."
And when they had sung an hymn, they
went out to the mount of Olives.

The

No. II.

The Passages in the Sixth Chapter of the Gospel of St. John, referred to in the "CONSIDERATIONS."

John, vi. 26.

JESUS answered them and said, Verily, verily I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but becaue ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.

27. Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed.

28. Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?

29. Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

30. They said therefore unto him, What sign shewest thou then, that we may see and believe thee? what doest thou work?

31. Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat.

32. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

33. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

34. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread.

35. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. * * * *

47. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me shall have everlasting life.

48. I am that bread of life.

49. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.

50. This is the bread which cometh down

down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.

51. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

52. The Jews therefore strove amongst themslves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

53. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

54. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

55. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

56 He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him

57. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.

58. This is that bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers

did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.

59. These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.

60. Many therefore of his disciples, when they heard this, said, This is an hard saying, who can hear it?

61. When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you?

62. What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?

63. It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

No. III.

An Examination *of Young Persons, and of others who may require it, before receiving the Holy Sacrament, from Bishop Wilson's* Parochialia: *with Alterations.*

"BECAUSE many Christians, especially the younger sort, and those whose instruction has been neglected, may not know upon what heads, and after what manner, they ought to examine themselves, or lest they should do it imperfectly, or perhaps not at all, a faithful friend or pastor will shew them the way, by examining them himself, after this or some such PLAIN METHOD."

1. *An Examination concerning* REPENTANCE.

Do you know that God will not accept of the services of such as live in the practice of any KNOWN SIN?

Let me therefore advise you, as you love your soul, to consider seriously,

whether you are subject to any EVIL HABIT, either of *lying*, or *swearing*, or *drinking*, or *uncleanness*, or *dishonesty*, or of an *idle life*, which will lead to these? And if you are, your duty is, to judge yourself, to beg God's pardon, and to amend your life.

Will you do this in OBEDIENCE TO GOD, because he requires it?

Will you promise sincerely to avoid all *occasions* of sin, especially of such sins as you have been most apt to fall into?

Will you endeavour to live in the fear of God, always remembering, that a GOOD LIFE is the best preparation for this Sacrament?

Will you constantly pray for God's grace and assistance, without which all your good purposes will come to nothing?

Will you strive to keep your conscience TENDER and AWAKE, and that your heart may not be hardened, which is the greatest evil that can befal you.

Lastly; will you be careful to keep a watch over yourself, that you may not fall into the sin you have repented of?

And will you often examine into the state of your soul, especially before you go

go to the Lord's Table, that you may see whether you grow in grace, and get the mastery over your corruptions? For if you do so, you are certainly under the government of God's *Holy Spirit*.

An Examination concerning Purposes of leading a New, *that is, a* CHRISTIAN LIFE.

Do you SINCERELY purpose to make the law of God the rule of your life?

Will you do whatever you believe will please God, and avoid what you know or suspect will displease him?

Will you shew, that you believe, and fear, and love God with all your heart, by being fearful of offending him, by giving him thanks for his mercies, and by praying to him daily for pardon, for grace, and for protection?

Will you have a great regard for every thing that belongs to God, his name, his church, his day, his word and holy ordinances?

Will you be careful to attend the public worship of God, and especially upon the

Lord's Day, as you hope for God's blessing the whole week following?

Will you reverence and obey your parents, your governors, and all to whom respect and obedience are justly due?

Will you endeavour to live peaceably and charitably with all men, avoiding all malice, revenge, ill-will, quarrelling, and contention?

Will you be chaste, sober, and temperate, as becomes a member of Christ and his family, avoiding all excess in meat and drink, and an idle life, which are the occasions of sins not fit to be named among Christians?

Will you be true in all your dealings, avoiding all wrong, oppression, and extortion?

And will you remember, that without restitution, or amending what you may have done wrong, where it can be done, there is no acceptance with God?

Will you be careful to speak the truth, avoiding the sins of lying, of perjury, of tale-bearing, and meddling with matters which do not belong to you, as things hateful to God and man?

Will

Will you be content with your lot, whatever it be; neither coveting what is another's, nor envying his prosperity, nor being glad at his calamities?

Lastly; will you do these things out of the love and reverence you bear to God, whose laws they are?

And will you seriously beg of him to write all these laws in your heart, and to incline and enable you to keep them?

An Examination concerning a lively FAITH *in God's Mercy through Christ.*

Do you stedfastly believe that Christians are saved by the blood of Jesus Christ, who died for you and all men on the cross?

Do you trust in Jesus Christ, and in what he has done and suffered for you, and in him only, for pardon and salvation?

Do you firmly believe that Jesus Christ is now in Heaven interceding with God for all such as on earth do religiously keep up the remembrance of his death, and receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper worthily, until his coming again?

Your faith being built upon the promises of God in Jesus Christ, and all his promises

promises being on condition that we live as becomes Christians; will you seriously purpose to do so?

And will you remember, not to presume on God's mercy, or expect that he will communicate his grace, either in the Sacrament or in any other way, while you continue under the power of a sinful life?

An Examination concerning a THANKFUL REMEMBRANCE *of Christ's death,*

Do you desire to have a thankful remembrance of Christ's death?

Consider then what he has done for you and all mankind; to recover us from a state of sin and misery.

We were all enemies to God by wicked works. Jesus Christ undertook to restore us again to God's favour. God therefore laid on him the iniquities of us all: for the sake of his death, God was pleased to overlook the untowardliness of our nature, to forgive us our sins, to look upon us as his children, to give us all the grace and assistance we shall want; and if we behave ourselves like his children in this state of trial, he will for Christ's sake, pardon our sins,

sins, and make us happy to all eternity when we die.

You see what reason we have to remember his death with thankful hearts.

Will you therefore keep these things in your heart, and shew your thankfulness for them, by living like one who has been redeemed from death and from damnation?

And will you be sure to remember this: That Jesus Christ did indeed die to redeem us from death? But that he must *first* redeem us from this sinful world, from our vain conversation, and from all iniquity; that is, he must make us holy that we may be happy, for "without holiness no man can see the Lord."

An Examination concerning CHARITY *with all Men.*

Our Lord Jesus Christ having by his death restored all mankind to the favour of God, he only expects this of us; that we should love one another as he loved us.

To this end, he hath appointed, that in this Sacrament we should all, as members of one family of which he is the master, as members of one body of which he is the

the head, that we should all eat of one bread in remembrance of his death, and in token of that strict union which there ought to be amongst all Christians.

Will you then walk in love as Christ hath loved us, and given himself for us?

Will you consider whether you have given any just occasion of offence, or injured any body; so as that you ought to ask their pardon, and make them restitution or amends?

And that no worldly shame may hinder you from doing so, you shall hear the very direction of Christ himself:

Matt. v. 23, 24. *If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there remembrest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.*

Will you therefore desire forgiveness of all such as you have offended?

And do you forgive all that have offended you?

Can you heartily pray for *every* body; and *will* you do so?

Will

Will you (as the Apostle directs) love, not in word only, but in deed and in truth; that is, doing good, as well as giving good words and making fair promises and professions?

You will see every day among Christians some naked, some hungry, some in affliction, some wanting comfort, others instruction: Will you, for Christ's sake, be kind to them, according to their wants and your power to help them?

If so, Then go with faith, and take the Holy Sacrament to your comfort.—And the peace of God which passeth all understanding, keep your heart and mind in the knowledge and love of God, and of his son Jesus Christ our Lord, and the blessing of God almighty, the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost, be with you, and remain with you always.

No.

No. IV.

Prayers composed and used by Samuel Johnson, LL.D. in his Preparation for receiving the Sacrament, at the Festival of Easter.

ALMIGHTY God, heavenly Father, who desirest not the death of a sinner, look down with mercy upon me. Grant me that grace without which I can neither will nor do what is acceptable to Thee. Pardon my sins; remove the impediments that hinder my obedience; enable me to redeem the time mispent in idleness and sin, by a diligent application of the days yet remaining, to the duties which thy Providence shall allot me. O God! grant me thy holy spirit, that I may repent and amend my life; grant me contrition, grant me resolution, for the sake of Jesus Christ, to whose covenant I now implore admission, and of the benefits of whose death I implore participation. For his sake have mercy on me, O God! for his sake

sake O God, pardon and receive me! Amen.

ALMIGHTY and most merciful Father, who hast created me to love and to serve thee, enable me so to partake of the Sacrament in which the death of Jesus Christ is commemorated, that I may henceforward lead a new life in thy faith and fear. Thou who knowest my frailties and infirmities, strengthen and support me; grant me thy Holy Spirit, that, after all my lapses, I may now continue stedfast in obedience; that after long habits of negligence and sin, I may at last, work out my salvation with diligence and constancy; purify my thoughts from all pollution, and fix my affections on things eternal. Much of my time past has been lost in sloth, and indifference to religion. Let not what remains O Lord, be given me in vain; but let me from this time lead a better life, and serve thee with a quiet mind, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen

ALMIGHTY and most merciful Father, look down upon my misery with pity, strengthen me that I may overcome all sinfu

sinful habits; grant that I may, with effectual faith, commemorate the death of thy son Jesus Christ, so that all corrupt desires may be extinguished, and all vain thoughts may be dispelled. Enlighten me with true knowledge, animate me with reasonable hope, comfort me with a just sense of thy love, and assist me in the performance of all holy purposes, that after the sins, errors, and miseries of this world, I may obtain everlasting happiness for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

Almighty and most merciful Father, who hast nothing that thou hast made, nor desirest the death of a sinner, look down with mercy upon me, and grant that I may turn from my wickedness and live. Forgive the days and years which I have passed in folly, idleness and sin. Fill me with such sorrow for the time mispent that I may amend my life according to thy holy word; strengthen me against habitual idleness and vice, and enable me to direct my thoughts to the performance of every duty; that while I live I may serve thee in the state to which thou shalt call me,

and

and at last by a holy and happy death be delivered from the struggles and sorrows of this life, and obtain eternal happiness by thy mercy, for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

ALMIGHTY God, by whose mercy I am now about to commemorate the death of my Redeemer, grant that from this time I may so live, as that his death may be efficacious to my eternal happiness; enable me to conquer all evil customs; deliver me from all evil thoughts, grant me light to discover my duty, and grace to perform it. As my life advances, let me become more pure, and more holy. Take not from me thy Holy Spirit, but grant that I may serve thee with diligence and confidence, and when thou shalt call me hence, receive me to everlasting happiness, for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

ALMIGHTY and most merciful Father, suffer me once more to commemorate the death of thy son Jesus Christ, my Saviour and Redeemer, and make the memorial of his death profitable to my salvation. by

strengthening my faith in his merits, and quickening my obedience to his laws. Remove from me, O God! all inordinate desires, all corrupt passions, and all vain terrors, and fill me with zeal for thy glory, and with confidence in thy mercy. Make me to love all men, and to use thy gifts, whatever thou shalt bestow, to the benefit of my fellow creatures. So lighten the weight of years, and so mitigate the afflictions of disease, that I may continue fit for thy service, and useful in my station. And so let me pass through this life, by the guidance of thy holy spirit, that at last I may enter into eternal joy, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

No. V.

PRAYERS *to be used in Preparation for the* SACRAMENT, *from Bishop* WILSON.

A Prayer for retaining a grateful Remembrance of what Christ has done for us in the Divine Institution of the Lord's Supper.

O JESUS! who hast loved us, and washed us from our sins, and redeemed us by thy blood, and didst ordain this Sacrament, as a grateful remembrance of what thou hast done and suffered for us, make me truly sensible of thy love, and of our sad condition, which required so great a sacrifice!

May I always receive this pledge of thy love, the offers of mercy, pardon, and grace, tendered to us in this holy ordinance, with a thankful heart, and in remembrance of Thee, our great and best be-

nefactor; in remembrance of thy holy example, of thy heavenly doctrine! of thy laborious life, of thy bitter passion and death, of thy glorious resurrection, of thy ascension into Heaven, and of thy coming again to judge the world!

And may I never forget the obligation thou hast laid upon us, to live as becomes thy disciples; and to forsake every course of life contrary to thy gospel: Cease not, O Lord, to love us; and by thy grace vouchsafed in this ordinance, cause us to love Thee with all our hearts. Amen.

A Prayer for Repentance.

Blessed be God, who by his grace, and by the voice of his church, hath called me to repentance! Grant, O thou Searcher of Hearts, that I may know, and confess, and forsake the sins I have fallen into. Give me that true repentance, to which thou hast promised mercy and pardon, that I may amend where I have done amiss, and that iniquity may not be my ruin. And, O blessed advocate! who ever livest to make intercession for us, let thy blood and merits

merits plead for me, and by thy mighty intercession procure for me the pardon of my past offences! That thou may'st say unto me in this holy Sacrament, as thou didst unto the penitent in the Gospel, "THY SINS ARE FORGIVEN THEE!" Amen.

A Prayer for Faith in God's Mercy.

I BESEECH thee, O God! by that love which moved thee to give thine own Son for lost mankind, give me a faith in thy promises for his sake, as firm as thy word, on which my faith is grounded: and let me never presume upon thy gracious promises, without sincerely endeavouring to perform the conditions on which they were made, and without being zealous of good works for which we were redeemed. May the remembrance of our Saviour's love, and of thy great mercy, be ever seasonably present with me, to keep me from despair! And may my faith in thy promises support me in the hour of death: May my Redeemer be my refuge, his blood and merits plead for me, that I may

have my lot and portion with those whom he hath purchased with his most precious blood! Amen.

A Prayer for true Charity, and Love of all Mankind.

"THIS is my commandment that ye "love one another, as I have loved you." Hear, O my soul, what thy Saviour has commanded thee; he who loved us, and gave himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for us.

May this thy love, O Jesus! be the motive and pattern of my love, and charity for all mankind! Where this hath not been my practice, I implore thy gracious pardon; and beseech thee to fortify my soul against all suggestions of Satan, or my corrupt nature, and blind passions: that I may always be prepared to go to thine altar, with the same charitable dispositions with which I desire to die!

Thou, O Jesus! madest thine enemies thy friends, by laying down thy life for them. Be thou my advocate with God for grace to follow thy heavenly charity and

and example, that I may overcome evil with good; that I, and all the members of thy unnumbered family, may love as brethren: that we who are now going to thy table may always meet as sincere friends, and part with true love and affection, as becomes thy disciples. Amen.

A Prayer for worthily receiving the Sacrament.

Grant, O God! that I may never draw down thy judgments upon myself, either by turning my back upon this ordinance, or by going to it without thought, and unworthily. May thy mercy pardon what is past, and give me grace, for the time to come, to consecrate my life to thee, and to embrace every occasion of remembering my Redeemer's love, and thereby securing thy favor, and my own salvation! And, if it be thy will, grant that I may always find such comfort and benefit in this ordinance, as may encourage me to observe it with joy unto my life's end!

Permit me, gracious Lord, humbly to recommend to thine infinite mercy the

miserable condition of all such as neglect so great means of grace and salvation. Awaken all christian people into a sense of this duty: open their eyes, and correct their mistakes, that they may be convinced, that this is an effectual means of making their peace with thee, of rendering themselves and their prayers acceptable to thy Divine Majesty, and of obtaining pardon and sanctification through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

No. VI.

DEVOTIONAL ASSISTANCE *for the Communion, from* BISHOP KEN: *with Alterations.*

A Prayer for PARDON.

O Thou, Father of mercies, and God of all consolation, be merciful to me a miserable sinner.

Behold, Lord, though my transgressions are many, yet have I confessed, bewailed and, resolved to forsake them. I come to thy table weary and heavy laden with the burden of my sins, be it unto me according to thy word. Thou art faithful and just; forgive me my sins, and cleanse me from all unrighteousness. Cast me not away from thy presence, but deliver me from my burden, that I may find rest in thee, and be enabled to say unto my soul, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.

O Heavenly

O Heavenly Father, for thine infinite mercies' sake for all the merits and sufferings of thy Son, in whom thou art always well-pleased, pardon all my sins, and receive me, a true penitent, into thy favour for ever. Amen.

A Prayer for GRACE.

O Blessed Saviour, perfect thy strength in my weakness; for in thee only is my trust. Thou hast promised to give thy holy spirit to those that ask it. Behold, Lord, I now most earnestly implore it; fulfil thy gracious promise; vouchsafe me that holy spirit I pray for, to purify my corrupt nature, to strengthen my weakness, to comfort me in troubles, to support me in adversity, to succour me in temptations, and to assist me in all parts of my duty, that I may ever hereafter live in thy fear, and in constant, sincere, and universal obedience.

Thou O searcher of hearts, knowest the sins I am most inclined to; and that particular failing in which is my greatest danger; grant me a double portion of thy invisible aid against it. Hold thou up my goings

goings in thy paths, that my footsteps slip not. O work in me that victorious faith, by which I may overcome the world, the devil, and my own corrupt nature.

True it is, O Lord God, that there are many sins which, upon examination I find, through thy grace, I have not yet committed, and therefore not unto me, Lord, but to thy name be the glory. But alas! there is in my corrupt nature so great a proneness to evil, so great an inclination to sin, that without thy restraining grace, every temptation, seconded by opportunity, may draw me from obedience, and overthrow my present resolutions.

But my help standeth in thee, O great Creator, who hast made heaven and earth; and I commit my soul to thy keeping. Vouchsafe to watch over me, that I may not be beguiled by the deceitfulness of sin, or betrayed by my own treacherous heart, or surprized by my ghostly enemies, and give me grace to watch and pray incessantly myself, lest I enter into temptation. Hear, Lord, from Heaven, and succour

cour me, for the alone merits of Jesus Christ my Saviour and Redeemer. Amen.

A Prayer for PARTICULAR *Graces.*

O that my ways were made so direct, that I might keep thy statutes, O Lord, for then shall I not be confounded, when I have respect unto all thy commandments.

Vouchsafe me thy holy spirit therefore, O Lord God, to work in me whatever is well-pleasing in thy sight, that for the time to come I may bring forth fruits, meet for repentance.

O let it be thy good pleasure to create in me a saving knowledge of thee and of my duty, justifying faith, true sanctifying grace, and a purifying hope, an ardent love, and a filial fear of thee, a constant desire of pleasing thee, and a great tenderness of offending thee.

Lord, create in me a penitent heart, a resigned will, and mortified affections, an habitual mindfulness of thy presence, and a steady devotion in my prayers, sincere intentions and zeal for thy glory, perseverance

verance in all holy purposes, and constancy in all trials and temptations.

Lord, create in me a reverential awe of thy name, a delight in thy service, a secret regard to this day and house of prayer, and a great attention to thy word; a daily care of my time, and diligence in all my praise-worthy pursuits and honest employments.

Lord, make me chaste and temperate, humble, meek, and patient of reproof; and create in me a chearful and gentle, a contented and considerate, a quiet and peaceful spirit.

Lord, bless me with health and competency of living, with a good understanding, a retentive memory, and a ready apprehension; and with such a portion of temporal good things, as thou seest fit for me, and give me grace to make a right use of all the blessings I have already received.

Lord, purify my thoughts, bridle my tongue, guide all my actions, guard all my senses, stop my ears, and turn away my eyes, from sin and vanity.

Lord, give me grace to be just in all my

my dealings, to do to all men as I would they should do to me; to be subject to my parents, and to all my lawful superiors and governors; O grant that I may render due honour and obedience to them all in their several stations.

Lord, make me willing to forgive injuries, and unwilling to offer any; make me grateful to my benefactors, friendly to my equals, condescending to my inferiors, compassionate to the afflicted, charitable to the poor, according to my ability, a lover of good men, and kind to my enemies; with a conscience void of offence towards thee, and towards men, and grace to continue in the communion of the church without wavering,

O merciful God, keep thy servant from all wilful, deliberate, or presumptuous sins, and let no wickedness have dominion over me.

From stubbornness and pride, idleness and sloth, intemperance and youthful lusts, inconstancy and lying, good Lord, deliver me.

From irreligious principles, and false teachers,

teachers, unruly passions, and violent temptations; from contracting vicious habits, or taking pleasure in sin; from profaneness and bad company, envy and malice, detraction and uncharitableness, good Lord deliver me.

From the errors and vices of the age, and all remaining affections to sin; from the sins my corrupt nature is most inclined to; from whatsoever is offensive to thee, or destructive to my own soul, good Lord, deliver me.

Hear me, O Heavenly Father, and conform my whole life to the example and precepts of my blessed Saviour, to whom be all honour and glory world without end. Amen.

Assistances *to Devotion at the* Time of receiving: *from the same.*

On going to the *Altar-Table.*

In the multitude of thy mercies, O Lord God, do I now approach thy table: O pardon my sins, and receive me graciously. Amen.

On giving the Alms, *or at the Offertory.*

Blessed

Blessed be thou, O Lord God; for all things come of thee, and of thy own do I now give thee.

O let this alms be an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable and well-pleasing to thee.

At the CONSECRATION *of the* ELEMENTS.

O blessed Jesus, in the bread broken, I call to mind thy body torn and tormented; and in the wine poured out, I call to mind thy precious blood shed for my sins.

Glory be to thee, O Lamb of God, that didst offer thyself a sacrifice to take away the sins of the whole world: Lord, have mercy on me and mine.

While others are *communicating*.

O my God, whom have I in heaven but thee? And there is none on earth I desire in comparison with thee.

As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God.

My soul is athirst for thee, O God, my God.

Blessed Saviour, I am thine, I am wholly thine,

thine, for thou bought me with a price, with the inestimable price of thy own blood.

When the Minister approaches the Communicant:

O Lord God, I now desire to renew my covenant with thee, and to seal it in this Sacrament.

Lord, put thy laws into my mind, and write them in my heart; and for the sufferings of thy Son, which I now commemorate, be merciful to my unrighteousness; my sins and my iniquities remember no more, but pour into my heart the abundance of thy grace.

After receiving the Bread:

Glory be to thee, O Lord, who feedest me with the Bread of Life.

O Lord God, who didst sanctify us by the offering of the body of Jesus once for all, sanctify me, even me, O Heavenly Father.

After receiving the Cup.

Glory be to thee, O Lord Jesus, who permittest me to drink of the fountain of life freely.

Blessed Saviour, thou hast loved us, and washed us from our sins in thy own blood, and therefore to thee be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen, amen.

Glory be to thee, O Jesus, my Lord and my God, for thus feeding my soul with thy most blessed body and blood: O let thy heavenly food transfuse new vigour into my soul, and unto the souls of all that communicate with me; that our faith may daily increase; that we may all grow more humble and contrite for our sins; that we may all love thee, and serve thee and praise thee with fervour and fidelity for evermore.

A Declaration of Forgiveness *of all Men; from Bishop Cosins.*

I do most humbly desire all, and every one whom I have offended, that they would vouchsafe to forgive me. And I do freely and heartily forgive all the world whereinsoever any hath offended me, or done me any manner of injury whatsoever, even as I desire to be forgiven of God, and

and to be absolved from my sins, for the merits of my blessed Redeemer. Amen.

A Thanksgiving after *Communion: by Dr. Edward Lake.*

Almighty God, the fountain of all goodness, from whom every good and perfect gift proceedeth, I desire most heartily to thank thee, who hast vouchsafed to feed me with *spiritual food*, to incorporate with the mystical body of thy Son, and to make me an heir of thine everlasting kingdom.

I am not worthy, O Lord of that daily bread which sustains the body, but thou hast made me partaker of that LIVING BREAD which came down from Heaven which nourisheth the soul, and of which whosoever eateth shall live for ever. O grant that my soul may ever relish this divine food, and feed on it by faith with thanksgiving. Grant that what thou hast bestowed on me in this Holy Communion, for the REMISSION OF my sins, may not, by any fault of my own, become the increase

crease of them, but may support and preserve me in every temptation; compose and rejoice me in every trouble; comfort and defend me in the hour of my death, and further me in the attainment of everlasting salvation, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Printed by R. WILKS,
Chancery-lane.

6431
265.323F
K778.2
Kuoy Vicesimas.

265.323F
K778.2

6431